

Mountain and Theophany in the Sinai Narrative*

The Sinai narrative in Exod 19–20; 24; 32–34 not only is a very specific datum within Old Testament writings, but also appears to be remarkably isolated with respect to considerable parts of that literature.

I

With regard to the events described in Exod 19 ff. there is a conspicuous silence in two categories of texts that otherwise speak expressly of Israel's earliest history, viz. the so-called historical summaries (e.g. Deut 26,5–9) and the books of the prophets.

1. The absence of the Sinai motif from the historical summaries has been signalized by von Rad⁽¹⁾; he, and Noth as well⁽²⁾,

(*) Adaptation of a lecture delivered for the Oud-Testamentisch Werkgezelschap in Nederland, June 1981.

(1) G. VON RAD, "Das formgeschichtliche Problem des Hexateuch" (1938), in ID., *Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament* (TB 8; München 1958) 9–86. Von Rad first mentions as a summary Deut 26,5–9, which he thinks is a very ancient text, notwithstanding some (later) Deuteronomic phrases; furthermore Deut 6,20–24; Josh 24,2–13; 1 Sam 12,8; Exod 15,4–16; Pss 78; 105; 135,8–12; 136.

(2) M. NOTH, *Überlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuch* (Darmstadt ²1960), 42, 48–54, 62–67; ID., *Geschichte Israels* (Göttingen ³1956) 120–121, 125–130. Here may also be mentioned N. K. GOTTWALD, *The Tribes of Yahweh; a Sociology of the Religion of Liberated Israel, 1250–1050 B.C.E.* (London 1980) 88–114. In Gottwald's opinion "von Rad has demonstrated that some sort of tradition-historical and cultic separation (...) does underlie the literary hiatus" (p. 89); one should not think, however, of a separation between two different conceptual worlds and festival programs, but rather of the different function of elements within one festival program. The centralizing cult of pre-monarchical Israel comprised (a) the *acts* of theophany, covenant making and law-giving; and, rooted in them, (b) thematic *recitals* of what YHWH had done for Israel (exodus-settlement traditions). Only secondarily were the *acts* historicized and inserted in the narrative history of Israel, as events that purportedly took place at Sinai. Cf. below, n. 45.

explained it from cultic circumstances. The summaries are said to be variants of an old cultic "creed" (von Rad), which recapitulated after a fixed canonical pattern traditions about the patriarchs, the exodus, the wilderness journey, and the settlement in Canaan. The Sinai narrative, being the *Festlegende* of the amphictyonic feast of the covenant renewal, existed on its own for a long time. It was only later on incorporated into the general Israelite tradition as put down in early historiography; only about the time of the exile it became part of the current image of the *Heilsgeschichte* (see Neh 9,13-14).

Many doubts have arisen about the veracity of these ideas. The notions of an Israelite amphictyony and a feast of the covenant renewal have been contested⁽³⁾. The alleged antiquity of such a text as Deut 26,5-9, and the very existence of the "creed" as a literary type, have been seriously doubted⁽⁴⁾. Also, it has been pointed out that, in historical summaries, the absence of the Sinai theme is often completely understandable from the purport and coherence of the text itself⁽⁵⁾. In Deut 26,5-10 the confession about the deliverance from Egypt, together with the declaration about living in Canaan as a gift from YHWH, are sufficient preparation for v. 10a: "And now, behold, I bring the firstfruits of the soil which thou, YHWH, hast given me"⁽⁶⁾. In Deut 6,21-25 the remembrance of the exodus

⁽³⁾ See e.g. G. FOHRER, *Geschichte der israelitischen Religion* (Berlin 1969) 56, 78-83; R. DE VAUX, *Histoire ancienne d'Israël; des origines à l'installation en Canaan* (Paris 1971) 380; A. D. H. MAYES, *Israel in the Period of the Judges* (London 1974); M. C. ASTOUR, "Amphictyony", *IDB, Suppl. Vol.* (1976) 23-25; C. H. J. DE GEUS, *The Tribes of Israel* (Assen 1976); GOTTWALD, *Tribes*, 345-357, 887-889.

⁽⁴⁾ See C. H. W. BREKELMANS, "Het 'historische Credo' van Israël", *Tijdschrift voor Theologie* 3 (1963) 1-11; Th. C. VRIEZEN, "The Credo in the Old Testament", in *Studies on the Psalms; papers read at the 6th meeting [of] Die Ou Testamentiese Werkgemeenskap in Suid-Afrika* (Potchefstroom 1963) 5-17; L. ROST, *Das kleine Credo und andere Studien zum Alten Testament* (Heidelberg 1965) 11-25; J. Ph. HYATT, "Were There an Ancient Historical Credo in Israel and an Independent Sinai Tradition?", in *Translating and understanding the Old Testament; essays in honor of H. G. May* (Nashville etc. 1970) 152-170; DE VAUX, *Histoire*, 379.

⁽⁵⁾ See A. S. VAN DER WOUDE, *Uittocht en Sinai* (Nijkerk 1960) 8, 10; DE VAUX, *Histoire*, 379; E. W. NICHOLSON, *Exodus and Sinai in History and Tradition* (Oxford 1973) 21-25.

⁽⁶⁾ Cf. VRIEZEN, "Credo", 14; ROST, *Kleine Credo*, 19.

from Egypt and of the entry into Canaan is a straight motivation for taking the commandments given at Horeb seriously. Often, an especial remembrance of the obligations as accepted at Sinai would be less than fitting within texts whose strength is obtained from something other, viz. stressing what YHWH had done as the liberator and helper of Israel⁽⁷⁾.

One may agree with the criticism of von Rad's and Noth's ideas, especially of the way they tie down the shaping of tradition to a literary genre or a cultic situation, and still ask whether the starting point of their view, viz. the absence of the Sinai theme from certain texts, has been sufficiently accounted for. As far as Josh 24 is concerned, for instance, there might be nothing strange in the fact that within the historical retrospect no mention is made of an obligation taken at Sinai. All the same it is remarkable that also in the later mentioning of the covenant making (vv.25-27) this element is missing completely. In Ps 78 the "testimony" and the "torah" themselves serve the end that the people "should put their trust in God, and not forget the works of God, but keep his commandments" (vv.5.7). But why is Sinai not mentioned here? Why is it not mentioned in Ps 105, a psalm that otherwise presupposes details of the Pentateuchal tradition? Of course, none of these facts in itself need be surprising; but their sum total is certainly remarkable.

2. The latter is the more so because also in the prophets there is a silence on the events at Sinai. Only in Malachi (5th century) does God speak of "the torah of Moses, my servant: that I commanded him at Horeb statutes and ordinances for all Israel" (3,22). In former times the prophets speak of the exodus from Egypt (Isa 11,16; 43,17; Jer 32,21; Hos 2,17; 11,1; 12,10; 13,4; Amos 2,10; 3,1; 9,7; Mic 7,15); of the parts of Moses, Aaron and Miriam therein (Isa 63,11-12; Mic 6,4; cf. Hos 12,14); of the wilderness time (Jer 2,2.6; Hos 13,5; Amos 2,10); of YHWH's injunction to the fathers and of the covenant he made with them (Jer 7,22-23; 11,7; 31,32; 34,13-14; Ezek 20). But we never hear about Moses as the proclaimer of the commandments or about Sinai as the place where these were given and where the covenant was made.

(7) Cf. A. WEISER, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (Göttingen 1966) 83-86.

II

Where in the Old Testament there is mention of the commandments which in olden times were given to Israel, the way of presenting things is sometimes different from the current picture in the Pentateuch.

1. A rather remarkable description is to be found in Ezek 20. Here it is said that already in Egypt, before the exodus, God has given a fundamental commandment (vv.5-7). Subsequently YHWH gives his statutes, ordinances and sabbaths to the fathers in the wilderness, but they ignore God's word (vv.10-13.16). Then, in the wilderness, he enjoins their children to pay attention to his statutes, but without result (vv.18-21.24). So YHWH swears that he will scatter Israel among the nations, and gives them ordinances that are not good (vv.23-26). This whole presentation of facts is singular in respect of the Pentateuchal narrative.

2. Ps 81 is also important⁽⁸⁾. In vv.10-11 the worship of strange gods is forbidden in terms very reminiscent of the Decalogue:

There shall be no strange god among you;
you shall not bow down to a foreign god.
I am YHWH, your God,
who brought you up from the land of Egypt...

These words are part of a reproving oracle, and it is often understood that YHWH directly addresses Israel here as a cultic community (cf. vv.2-4). But this interpretation does not tally with the words that follow, v.12:

But my people did not listen to my voice;
Israel would have none of me.

One definitely gets the impression here that the foregoing was a quotation, in the sense that YHWH recalled his earlier words⁽⁹⁾. This impression is confirmed by v.8:

⁽⁸⁾ Cf. Th. BOOIJ, *Godswoorden in de Psalmen, hun funktie en achtergronden* (Amsterdam 1978) 168-171.

⁽⁹⁾ Thus F. DELITZSCH, *Die Psalmen* (Leipzig 41883) 582; J. RIDDERBOS, *De Psalmen II* (Commentaar op het Oude Testament; Kampen 1958) 322.

In distress you called, and I rescued you;
 I answered you from covering thunderclouds⁽¹⁰⁾;
 I tested you at the waters of Meribah.

Here “answering” is not merely an active reaction to Israel’s “calling” (cf. *’nh* in e.g. Pss 3,5; 4,2; 20,7), but — so it seems to me — is speaking as well (cf. *’nh* in Ps 99,6-7; Exod 19,19). As appears from Exod 15,25-26 (see also 20,20) the “testing” (*bḥn*, synonym of *nsh pi’el*, see Ps 26,2; 95,9) can also be done in speaking, namely in a way of speaking that aims at revealing a choice. Thus in my opinion Ps 81,8 is an introduction to the quotation of vv.9-11. This means that a commandment which according to Exod 19-20 was spoken at Mount Sinai, was spoken according to Ps 81 at “the waters of Meribah”.

3. Even in Exodus we now and then meet a text in which the announcing of YHWH’s will is situated in such a way that it hardly seems to be in keeping with the Sinaitic revelation as described afterwards.

In Exod 15,25 is said: “There (i.e., at Marah) he made for them statutes and ordinances” (*šām šām lô ḥōq ūmišpāt*). The words remind one very much of Josh 24,25 (*wayyāšēm lô ḥōq ūmišpāt*) and perhaps imply here, as well as there, a covenant making. The passage following after it is mostly regarded as Deuteronomistic; and, indeed, the thought and formulation in Exod 15,26 strongly remind one of texts in Deuteronomy⁽¹¹⁾. Still it may be doubted whether the Deuteronomistic character is also inherent in the words quoted above. Is it plausible that a Deuteronomistic author linked the making of statutes and ordinances precisely with Marah? I think it is more likely that here we have a rather ancient element of tradition⁽¹²⁾.

There is also the tradition of Exod 18,16, where Moses says to his father-in-law Jethro, “I make them know the statutes and laws of God”. This remark, which closely binds the announcement of *ḥuqqīm* and *tôrôt* to a procedure in which justice is obtained by

⁽¹⁰⁾ Cf. *sēter* in Ps 18,12; Job 22,14.

⁽¹¹⁾ Cf. Deut 7,15; 28,60; also e.g. 6,17-18; 7,11-12; 13,19; 27,10.

⁽¹²⁾ In this view Moses is the subject of *šām* in v.25b (cf. Josh 24,25, where Joshua is subject).

“consulting God” (v.15), is certainly striking in the given context, right before the Sinaitic revelation.

It would seem that in Exodus something can be discerned of a layer of tradition in which the announcement of God’s will is not specifically linked up with one place and situation.

III

Within the complex Exod 1–18 there are still other elements which have a certain “unruliness” with respect to the Sinai narrative.

1. The distribution of the names denoting the holy mountain deserves consideration. It is often said that the name Sinai is characteristic of the “Yahwist” and of “P”; the name Horeb is said to be characteristic of the “Elohist”⁽¹³⁾. One could put it differently. In the first part of Exodus “Sinai” only occurs in 16,1, which is reckoned among the Priestly texts⁽¹⁴⁾. For the rest the text has “mountain of God” (Exod 3,1; 4,27; 18,5) and “Horeb” (Exod 3,1; 17,6). From chapter 19 on we find the name Sinai⁽¹⁵⁾; here “Horeb” only occurs in Exod 33,6, “mountain of God” only in 24,13.

2. In Exodus the Midianites are mentioned only before chapter 19. Exod 2,15–22 tells about Moses’ flight to Midian; Exod 3–4 about the revelation given to Moses when he kept the flocks of his Midianite father-in-law Jethro; Exod 18 about Jethro’s visit to Moses after the exodus, and, among other things, about a communal sacrificial meal. In Exod 18,27 we then read that Moses dismissed his father-in-law and that the latter returned to his country — a statement which, coming immediately before chapter 19, seems to justify Gunneweg’s point of view: the narrator does not fail “den Midianiter rechtzeitig, ehe der heilige Sinai-Akt beginnt, in sein Land zurückzuschicken”⁽¹⁶⁾. The matter is the more remarkable because

⁽¹³⁾ See e.g. J. Ph. HYATT, *Exodus* (New Century Bible; London 1971) 203; W. ZIMMERLI, *Grundriss der alttestamentlichen Theologie* (Stuttgart etc. 1975) 59; A. D. H. MAYES, *Deuteronomy* (NCB; London 1979) 115.

⁽¹⁴⁾ This is based on the precise definition of time (cf. below, n. 67) and the phrase *’adat bēnē-yiśrā’el* (cf. Exod 16,9–10; 35,4; Lev 16,5; 19,2; Num 1,2,53; 13,26; etc). In P the name Sinai is current indeed.

⁽¹⁵⁾ Exod 19,1.2.11.18.20.23; 24,16; 31,18; 34,2.4.29.32; etc.

⁽¹⁶⁾ A. H. J. GUNNEWEG, “Mose in Midian”, *ZTK* 61 (1964) 8.

at the departure from Sinai, in the person of Hobab, father-in-law or (maybe better) son-in-law of Moses⁽¹⁷⁾, the Midianites turn up again as if they had never been away (Num 10,29). It is important to note here that the stories in which Moses or Israel have friendly relations with the Midianites, are considered to represent old tradition. The experiences which Israel afterwards had with the Midianites in Canaan, were not so positive at all, and even in the Pentateuch we find texts testifying to a most hostile attitude towards that people⁽¹⁸⁾.

3. There appears to be a third point of difference concerning the very essence of the sojourn at the mountain⁽¹⁹⁾. In Exod 3,12 YHWH says to Moses at Horeb: "And this shall be the sign for you that it is I who have sent you: when you have brought the people out of Egypt, you shall all serve God upon this mountain". The "serving" of God ('*bd*') returns in some places where Moses admonishes Pharaoh, or has to admonish him, to let Israel go, viz.: that they may serve God in the wilderness⁽²⁰⁾. In view of similar texts in Exodus we can specify this "serving" as "to sacrifice" (*zbbh*)⁽²¹⁾ and "to hold a feast" (*hgg*)⁽²²⁾.

Something of this "serving" is found in Exod 18,12, where we are told about a sacrificial meal held by Jethro, Aaron and the elders before YHWH. If, however, we look at Exod 19 ff., it appears that here the "serving" of God, in the sense mentioned, is not at all as essential as we might expect. Actually, the clearest instance of it is

(17) The relationship is not clear. Is to be read here and in Judg 4,11 *hātan* instead of *hōten*? See BHS; cf. e.g. W. F. ALBRIGHT, "Jethro, Hobab and Reuel in early Hebrew tradition", *CBQ* 25 (1963) 6-7. Is *hōten mōšeh* an apposition to *re'ū'el*? Cf. Exod 2,18; as to the construction see e.g. 1 Sam 14,50 beside 2 Sam 2,8; 1 Kgs 2,8.

(18) See Num 25,6ff.; 31,1ff.; Judg 6-8. Cf. e.g. GUNNEWEG, "Mose in Midian", 7; DE VAUX, *Histoire*, 313; H. JAGERSMA, *Geschiedenis van Israël in het Oudtestamentische tijdvak* (Kampen 1979) 62 (lit.). G. W. COATS, "Moses in Midian", *JBL* 92 (1973) 3-10, contends that the kernel of the tradition about Moses' stay in Midian is his marriage to a daughter of Jethro. The intention of this tradition would be to account for the special relationship between Moses and a Midianite priest (see Exod 18).

(19) Cf. G. VON RAD, "Beobachtungen an der Moseerzählung Exodus 1-14", *EvT* 31 (1971) 585-586.

(20) Exod 4,23; 7,16.26; 8,16; 9,1.13; etc.

(21) Exod 3,18; 5,3.8.17; 8,4.21-25; cf. 10,9.26.

(22) Exod 5,1; cf. 10,9.

in Exod 32, where a feast to YHWH is described (*ḥag lyhwh*) which is celebrated with burnt-offerings and peace offerings (vv.5-6). But on account of its idolatrous connotations this feast can hardly be considered the "sign" meant in Exod 3,12.

In the account of Exod 24,3-8 it is said that the young men of the Israelites offered burnt-offerings and sacrificed peace offerings to YHWH (v.5, *'ōlōt, z'bhām ślāmīm*). These offerings figure in the context of a covenant making between YHWH and Israel. In order to confirm the covenant, Moses sprinkles half of the blood of the sacrificial animals on the altar and half on the people. Thus the offerings acquire a meaning which seems to be more specific than that of the "serving" in Exod 3,12.

In Exod 24,11 we are told how the nobles of Israel saw God on the mountain, and ate and drank. More often than not it is supposed that "eating and drinking" refers to a sacrificial meal here; Nicholson, however, feels that it simply stands for: to stay alive (cf. v.11a)⁽²³⁾. I think that both views have an element of truth. Connotations of "eating and drinking" occurring elsewhere justify — so it seems to me — the following interpretation: although the elders saw God they did not die, but they ate and drank and rejoiced before God as people rejoice at the sacrificial meal (cf. e.g. Exod 18,12; Deut 12,7; 27,7; Ezek 44,3; Ps 36,9; 1 Chr 29,22). All the same it is doubtful whether an actual sacrificial meal is being indicated, or rather receiving gifts directly from God (cf. Isa 25,6). In any case Nicholson is right when he states that the text does not stress what the elders did, but the unique thing they experienced⁽²⁴⁾. — The account of vv.9-11 was only later united with vv.3-8⁽²⁵⁾. The junction probably implies the idea that "eating and drinking" was actually a sacrificial meal. In that case too, it remains improbable that this element links up, within an original narrative unity, with Exod 3,12. The very brevity of the information in 24,11 tells against such a connection.

⁽²³⁾ E. W. NICHOLSON, "The Origin of the Tradition in Exodus XXIV 9-11", *VT* 26 (1976) 148-150, with reference to, among other places, 1 Kgs 4,20; Jer 22,15.

⁽²⁴⁾ E. W. NICHOLSON, "The Interpretation of Exodus XXIV 9-11", *VT* 24 (1974) 88-94.

⁽²⁵⁾ See e.g. M. NOTH, *Das zweite Buch Mose* (ATD 5; Göttingen 1961) 157-158. Cf. below, n. 84, VII, 2.

In general one can say that in Exod 19–20; 24; 32–34 the heart of the matter is not “serving” God, “feasting”, and “offering”, but rather God’s “descending” (Exod 19,11.18; 34,5) and imperative “speaking”, and the covenant between him and Israel (Exod 24,8; 34,27).

IV

If we accept a certain breach between Exod 18 and Exod 19, it may be useful to pay more attention to the names which, as indications of the place where people meet YHWH, appear to be most characteristic of the complexes on both sides, viz. “mountain of God” and “Horeb” on one side, “Sinai” on the other.

1. In Exod 3,1 we meet the names “Horeb” and “mountain of God” in succession: Moses, keeping the flock of his father-in-law, “came to the mountain of God, to Horeb”. Noth feels that *ḥōrebāh* after *’el-har ḥā’ēlōhīm* lags behind (“nachhinkt”) and that it is a later addition⁽²⁶⁾. This opinion has been taken up by others⁽²⁷⁾. Now it is striking that the linking of “Horeb” with “mountain of God” also occurs in 1 Kgs 19,8, where it is told that Elijah went forty days and forty nights *’ad har ḥā’ēlōhīm ḥōreb*. The supposition that here *ḥōreb* is a gloss too⁽²⁸⁾, does not seem very plausible. As for the chosen form in Exod 3,1 — a local adjunct with preposition *’el*, followed by a place-name with locative *-ā* as an apposition —, we have the same construction in Ezek 16,29: *’el-’ereṣ kēna’an kašdīmā*, “towards the trading land, Chaldea”⁽²⁹⁾.

We furthermore meet *ḥōrēb* in Exod 17,6, where in Noth’s opinion it is secondary once more⁽³⁰⁾. It is likely indeed that the pas-

⁽²⁶⁾ NOTH, *Das zweite Buch Mose*², 20.

⁽²⁷⁾ See e.g. COATS, “Moses in Midian”, 6; L. PERLITT, “Sinai und Horeb”, in *Beiträge zur alttestamentlichen Theologie; Festschrift W. Zimmerli* (Göttingen 1977) 309; W. H. SCHMIDT, *Exodus* (BK II/2; Neukirchen 1977) 136–137.

⁽²⁸⁾ Thus SCHMIDT, *Exodus*, 137.

⁽²⁹⁾ On account of the Greek, the word *kēna’an* is sometimes left out, but wrongly. Cf. W. ZIMMERLI, *Ezechiel* (BK XIII/1; Neukirchen 1969) 337–338, with reference to, i.a., Gen 11,31; 12,5; 20,1. For the form *kašdīmāh* cf. Ez 11,24; 23,16. For *’ereṣ kēna’an* as “trading land” cf. Ezek 17,4.

⁽³⁰⁾ NOTH, *Das zweite Buch Mose*², 112; PERLITT, “Sinai und Horeb”, 309. On Exod 17,1–7 see also below, VI, 1.

sage in question has a text-corruption. In v.5 Moses is told to pass on before the people with some of the elders. Then it continues: "and take in your hand your rod, with which you struck the Nile, and go. Behold, I will stand before you there, by the rock at Horeb, and you shall strike the rock..." We are not told where Moses must go (v.5 *w^hālāktā*), and so in v.6 it is not clear what *šām* refers to. But I do not think this is a decisive reason for eliminating "at Horeb" as secondary. Probably, at the end of v.5 an indication of direction has dropped out. If that is right, "by the rock at Horeb" in v.6 gives a more precise indication of the place.

2. The name *har hā'ēlōhīm*, "mountain of God", to be distinguished from *har 'ēlōhīm*, "mountain of the gods"⁽³¹⁾, appears to be especially connected with Israel's pre- and earliest history. Apart from Exod 3,1 and 1 Kgs 19,8, it occurs in Exod 4,27 and 18,5. Moreover, in Num 10,33 this name may be hidden in *har yhw^h*. In other texts "mountain of YHWH" is mostly a designation of Zion⁽³²⁾; I think that in Num 10,33 the reading *yhw^h* is due to a Yahwistic redaction.

As Weisman has explained⁽³³⁾, *har hā'ēlōhīm* has connotations in which the conceptions "wilderness", "Midianites", "God of the Hebrews", and "to meet" play a part. In Exod 3,1; 4,27; 18,5, as well as in 1 Kgs 19,4 ff., the mountain of God is mentioned together with the wilderness. With reference to the texts in Exodus it is often held that the wilderness and the mountain are part of the Midianite land. But in the texts themselves there is no support for this⁽³⁴⁾. In Exod 18 there is a distinction between the land of Jethro (v.27) and the mountain in the wilderness, where Jethro visits Moses (v.5). In Num 10 the Midianite Hobab is very familiar with the wilderness (v.31); but the mountain of God clearly lies outside his country, where he says he wishes to return (v.30)⁽³⁵⁾. In Exod 4,27

⁽³¹⁾ Ezek 28,14,16; Ps 68,16.

⁽³²⁾ Gen 22,14; Isa 2,3; 30,29; Mic 4,2; Zech 8,3; Ps 24,3.

⁽³³⁾ Z. WEISMAN, "The Mountain of God" (Hebr.), *Tarbiz* 47 (1978) 107-119.

⁽³⁴⁾ WEISMAN, "Mountain of God", 113, 114. See also COATS, "Moses in Midian", 6-7.

⁽³⁵⁾ Here it is presumed that v.33a is an original continuation of vv.29-32. Hobab's answer to Moses was possibly implicit in the original version of

Moses and Aaron apparently meet between Egypt and the Midianite territory, at the mountain. Midian's position with regard to the mountain is comparable with that of Egypt, although in the cultic sphere there is a difference too. Because an offering on Egyptian territory would be a disgrace (Exod 8,22), Moses requests the pharaoh to let the Israelites go on "a three days' journey into the wilderness" to serve their God (Exod 3,18; 5,3; 8,23). A three days' journey seems to be the distance a people or clan can cover before having to rest for a longer period (Exod 15,22; Num 10,33); at the same time it is the shortest distance that separates rival parties (Gen 30,36). Obviously the latter is also valid with regard to the cult: one has to journey three days into the wilderness in order to be out of the Egyptian cultic territory⁽³⁶⁾.

So, as Weisman puts it, the mountain of God is extra-territorial; it lies outside Egypt, first of all, and outside Midian, "behind the wilderness" (Exod 3,1). There, beyond human territory, it is a holy place and a meeting place for nomadic or partly nomadic groups like the Midianites (see Exod 18,5.12; cf. 3,1), and also for "Hebrews", i.e. *Ḥabiru*: strangers, wanderers, former convicts⁽³⁷⁾. The God who has the mountain as a dwelling place "meets" people there: "the God of the Hebrews has met with us" (Exod 3,18; 5,3: *qrh niph'al*)⁽³⁸⁾. However, he does not reveal himself in awful majesty to a whole people, but discloses himself, suddenly, to an intermediary, a "man of God", with the sign of a flame (Exod 3,2), or in a simple direct appearance (Exod 17,6)⁽³⁹⁾.

3. Outside Exodus, Leviticus and Numbers, and apart from the late text Neh 9,13, "Sinai" is not used as the name of a mountain

the story, in which Hobab went before the people to find them a place to rest (cf. Judg 1,16; 4,11).

⁽³⁶⁾ The three days' journey has a function in the negotiations with the pharaoh; it does not actually denote the distance to the mountain of God.

⁽³⁷⁾ Cf. e.g. H. CAZELLES, "The Hebrews", in D. J. WISEMAN [ed.], *Peoples of Old Testament Times* (London 1973; repr. 1975) 1-28. In Egyptian letters from the Amarna period it is stated that the pharaoh let groups of *Ḥabiru* live "in the towns of Kašu". This Kašu is presumably identical with *kāšān*, which, remarkably enough, is mentioned in Hab 3,7 together with Midian. See CAZELLES, "The Hebrews", 13; also e.g. H. GRESSMANN, *Mose und seine Zeit* (Göttingen 1913) 271; DE VAUX, *Histoire*, 313-314.

⁽³⁸⁾ Cf. WEISMAN, "Mountain of God", 114-119.

⁽³⁹⁾ Cf. Num 23,3-4.15-16; WEISMAN, "Mountain of God", 118.

where torah was given and a covenant was made, but as the designation of a place in the south from where YHWH "shines forth" (Deut 33,2; see also Ps 68,18 cj, *bā' missīnay*); or, Sinai is mentioned in close connection with such a glorious event, which makes the earth tremble, the heavens drip, and the mountains quake (Judg 5,4-5; Ps 68,8-9)⁽⁴⁰⁾. YHWH's "going forth" or "coming" aims at helping and liberating Israel (Judg 5,4 ff.; cf. Hab 3,3-4.12-14). In Ps 68,8-9 we have a variant: YHWH majestically goes before his people on its way to Canaan. In Deut 33,2-3.5 YHWH's coming from Sinai apparently leads to his inauguration as King in Israel⁽⁴¹⁾.

It is important that among the texts in which the above theophany conception occurs, there is at least one — Judg 5 — that can be considered very ancient. The phrase *yhwh ('ēlōhīm) zeh sīnay*, "YHWH (God), the One of Sinai"⁽⁴²⁾, in Judg 5,5 and Ps 68,9, also seems to be very archaic. Apparently the conception in question dates from early times. Moreover, it is closely linked with the Canaanite world⁽⁴³⁾. The myths of Ugarit describe Baal as "the rider on the clouds", who manifests himself in storm, thunder and lightning, while the mountains quake and the heavens drip water⁽⁴⁴⁾.

There are differences between the theophany conception of the above texts and that of Exod 19-20. In Exod 19 God comes down on Sinai, in the other texts he comes from Sinai. In Exod 19-20

⁽⁴⁰⁾ Cf. e.g. H. D. PREUSS, "*bō'*", *TWAT* I, 563-565.

⁽⁴¹⁾ Deut 33,26-29 is probably the continuation of the song in vv.2-5. V.4 seems to interrupt the sequence of thought (v.5 probably referring to YHWH); presumably this verse, or v.4a, is secondary in the present context. See e.g. I. L. SEELIGMAN, *VT* 14 (1964) 78-79; H. SEEBASS, *VT* 27 (1977) 159.

⁽⁴²⁾ Cf. J. M. ALLEGRO, "Uses of the Semitic Demonstrative Element *z* in Hebrew", *VT* 5 (1955) 309-312.

⁽⁴³⁾ See J. JEREMIAS, *Theophanie. Die Geschichte einer alttestamentlichen Gattung* (Neukirchen-Vluyn 1965) 85-87; R. J. CLIFFORD, *The Cosmic Mountain in Canaan and the Old Testament* (Cambridge, Mass., 1972) 111-120; F. M. CROSS, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic* (Cambridge, Mass., 1973) 147-169.

⁽⁴⁴⁾ See e.g. A. CAQUOT, M. SZNYCER et A. HERDNER, *Textes ougaritiques* I (Paris 1974) 200, 201 (11. 11 and 18), 207-208 (11.68-71), 211 (1.122), 216-217 (11.28ff.), 247 (11.6-7) (= resp. *CTA* 4: III: 11 and 18; 4: V: 68-71 and 122; 4: VII: 28ff.; 5: V: 6-8).

mention is made of fire, quake, thunder, lightning, a cloud, smoke, blast of trumpets; in the other texts fire, earthquake, luminosity, heavy rain. And yet, insofar as both conceptions present YHWH's coming in terms of awesome natural phenomena, and both speak of Sinai, they are definitely related.

V

Starting from the data and connotations mentioned under IV, I think an explanation can be found for the "unruliness" of parts of the Old Testament regarding the Sinai passages in Exodus⁽⁴⁵⁾. At the same time, this explanation may be the answer to a question put by Jörg Jeremias⁽⁴⁶⁾: If, for example as Noth says, the Sinai narrative of Exodus contains a very ancient tradition indeed, how then can it be explained that the theophany scenes, as pictured there, did not have a stronger influence on those texts which describe the appearance of YHWH as his coming from the southern wilderness, or possibly from heaven⁽⁴⁷⁾, from Zion⁽⁴⁸⁾, or from the north⁽⁴⁹⁾? In my opinion the answer must be that the theophany description in Exodus is not so original as supposed.

1. At the mountain of God YHWH meets Moses in a flame, or in a direct appearance, without the violence of nature forces⁽⁵⁰⁾. The narrative of 1 Kgs 19,8 ff. proves that, at least in later times,

(45) It should be clear that my approach is very different from GOTTWALD's; see above, n. 2. Gottwald, partly endorsing Noth's views, argues in great measure from a sociological point of view, which in itself is undoubtedly justified. I think, however, that in his actual argument certain literary data (as mentioned) are not sufficiently accounted for. VON RAD, "Beobachtungen", 584-587, raises the question of the relationship between Exod 3 and Exod 19-20; 24. He arrives at the conclusion "dass sich im Buch Exodus zwei von einander ursprünglich ganz unabhängige und auch inhaltlich sehr verschiedene Sinaitraditionen gegenüberstehen" (p. 587). On terminological grounds alone this conclusion would appear not to be quite acceptable. See further below.

(46) See JEREMIAS, *Theophanie*, 110-111; cf. 154-155.

(47) Isa 63,19; Mic 1,3-4; Ps 18,8ff.; etc.

(48) Ps 50,2-3.

(49) Ezek 1,4ff.

(50) See above, IV, 2. There is a comparable situation in Exod 33,21-23.

the experience of God's presence at Horeb *could* be imagined in connection with storm, earthquake, and fire (vv.11-12). We read, though, that Elijah regarded these phenomena merely as heralds of YHWH's coming. Only at "the sound of a light whisper"⁽⁵¹⁾ he wrapped his face in his mantle and stood at the entrance of the cave to meet God (v.13). This action, I imagine, has something of the ancient conception about the way in which God let himself be found at Horeb⁽⁵²⁾.

However, in the description of Exod 19-20 YHWH's coming itself takes place in thunder and fire, and here it concerns the whole people. The fact that this account coincides with the introduction of the name Sinai points, I think, to a far-reaching interference: the mountain-of-God tradition was united with a very specific theophany conception.

2. To a certain extent the theophany description of Exod 19-20 fits into a broader setting of texts in which, in the wilderness period, the coming and speaking of YHWH goes with atmospheric phenomena. I think Exod 19,9a may be mentioned, where it is said that God is coming in a thick cloud to Moses to speak with him⁽⁵³⁾. According to other texts God would descend for that purpose in a pillar of cloud, which settled down at the door of the tent of meeting⁽⁵⁴⁾. The accounts in question can be related to current conceptions of YHWH's majestic appearance in clouds and darkness⁽⁵⁵⁾. This is clearly also true of Ps 81,8-11⁽⁵⁶⁾, where, after a reminder of the forced labour in Egypt, it is said that YHWH answered Israel from thunderclouds and tested it at Meribah by confronting it with his commandment: "There shall be no strange god among you. . . I am YHWH, your God, who brought you up from the land of Egypt".

⁽⁵¹⁾ I join the traditional interpretation of *qôl d'māmāh daqqāh*. Another view has been proposed by P. A. H. DE BOER and was worked out by J. LUST; see *VT* 25 (1975) 110-115.

⁽⁵²⁾ From a traditio-critical point of view there may be a connection between 1 Kgs 19,11ff. and Exod 33,21-23.

⁽⁵³⁾ See below, nn. 66, 82.

⁽⁵⁴⁾ Exod 33,9.11; Num 11,16-17.25; cf. Num 12,5; Deut 31,14-15; Ps 99,7.

⁽⁵⁵⁾ See e.g. 1 Kgs 8,10-11; Ps 18,10-15; 97,2-4; Isa 19,1; Ezek 1,4; 10,4.

⁽⁵⁶⁾ See above, II, 2.

Ps 81 is probably to be dated in the later pre-exilic period⁽⁵⁷⁾. At that time people apparently told about a theophany at Meribah in which YHWH had revealed himself in thunder and had claimed Israel for his service. It is likely that such an event could be associated with other places as well — for example with the old mountain of God. At any rate, *this* is the place where, in Exod 19–20, a later author located the event once for all⁽⁵⁸⁾. He did it emphatically by the key-word “Sinai” — the point of which seems to be clear: the majesty in which YHWH came to proclaim his commandments and so to “try” Israel (Exod 20,20; cf. Ps 81,8)⁽⁵⁹⁾, was the

(57) It can hardly be fortuitous that the exile is not mentioned in a text so emphatically speaking of the unfaithfulness of the people. The way vv.15–16 speak of the enemies and their possible humiliation, fits in with the time of the Assyrian or Neo-Babylonian expansion, better than with the Persian period. The psalm, or its first part, may be of North-Israelite origin (v.6). See further BOOIJ, *Godswoorden*, 172–174.

(58) For a somewhat comparable view see V. FRITZ, *Israel in der Wüste* (Marburg 1970) 127–128. Fritz feels that “die Sinaierzählung die traditions-geschichtliche Weiterbildung der Gottesbergüberlieferung sein muss”. In his opinion the tradition of the mountain of God has been preserved by the Elohist; the “Sinaitic” version came from the Yahwist. “Das traditions-geschichtliche Nacheinander von Gottesberg und Sinaiüberlieferung ist mit der Zusammenlegung von Jahwist und Elohist zu einem literarischen Nebeneinander geworden, doch bereitet noch der Jahwist die Theophanie am Sinai durch die Offenbarung an Mose am Dornstrauch in Midian vor”. — Here, in my opinion, a too strong attachment to the documentary hypothesis furthers a misconception of the relationship between Exod 3 and Exod 19–20. In unison with Gunneweg, Fritz also thinks that in the story of the stay at Sinai the Midianites have been deliberately excluded (p. 128); it is not clear how this view can be made to agree with ascribing Num 10,29–32 to J (p. 14).

(59) On the “trying” or “testing” see above, II, 2. Cf. B. S. CHILDS, *Exodus* (London 1974) 372. — It may be assumed that the Ten Words in some shorter form occurred in the oldest narrative of the Sinai theophany (cf. Ps 81,10–11). The ancient Book of the Covenant, with the narrative of the covenant making in Exod 24,3–8, has probably been added afterwards. Its introduction, at least in Exod 20,22, has been influenced by Deuteronomy (see Deut 4,36); cf. E. W. NICHOLSON “The Decalogue as the direct address of God”, *VT* 27 (1977) 429. For *sēper habbērīt* in Exod 24,7 cf. 2 Kgs 23,2,21. It is doubtful whether the oldest Sinai narrative held any account of a covenant ceremony. According to Deut 5,2ff. (cf. 4,23) God made the covenant at Horeb by proclaiming the Decalogue; in Deut 4,13 (cf. 9,11.15) the Decalogue itself is named a covenant.

same majesty in which of old he went forth, liberating and revenging, from the southern wilderness. Thus YHWH's claims on Israel were given a very great and dramatic weight⁽⁶⁰⁾.

3. From Exod 19 on the mountain of God is "Mount Sinai" (*har sînay*, vv.11.18.20 etc.). It is in itself not plausible that, geographically, this Sinaitization adds a completely strange element. In the theophany texts Deut 33,2, Judg 5,4-5 and Hab 3,3 Sinai, Seir, Edom⁽⁶¹⁾ and Paran, or Teman⁽⁶²⁾ and Paran, standing side by side, refer to a large territory south of Canaan, from where YHWH may appear. I think it is plausible that in this context "Sinai", as well as the other names⁽⁶³⁾, stands for a region rather than a mountain⁽⁶⁴⁾. On the other hand, the phrase *yhwh ('ēlōhîm) zeh sînay* (Judg 5,5; Ps 68,9) points to a very special relation. It is well imaginable that of old Sinai was the name of a mountainous region or wilderness (cf. Exod 19,1-2; Lev 7,38, etc.) in which the mountain of God was situated⁽⁶⁵⁾. Perhaps, the combination *har sînay* in Exod 19 ff. is new in that it now denotes a mountain, not a mountain range.

4. At the transformation of the tradition in Exod 19 ff., both the theophany motif and the mountain-of-God tradition were modified. The liberating *coming from* Sinai became an awe inspiring *descending on* the mountain. In addition to it there is the motif of the rising smoke, which perhaps has been derived from volcanism, and the blast of the trumpet, which may have a cultic origin⁽⁶⁶⁾. As

⁽⁶⁰⁾ As to the notion of dramatization cf. J. WELLHAUSEN, *Israelitische und Jüdische Geschichte* (Berlin ⁸1921) 12. It may be stated here that in my belief the Ten Words hold demands that were of old essential in the service of YHWH; I think this is especially true of the first word: "You shall have no other gods before me". Cf. e.g. Gen 35,2-4; Exod 22,19; Josh 24,14.23; Hos 4,2; Mic 2,2.

⁽⁶¹⁾ See also Isa 63,1.

⁽⁶²⁾ In the Kuntillet 'Ajrud inscriptions we meet the combination *yhwh tmn*, "YHWH of Teman"; cf. J. A. EMERTON, "New Light on Israelite Religion; the implications of the inscriptions from Kuntillet 'Ajrud", *ZAW* 94 (1982) 1-20.

⁽⁶³⁾ Teman: cf. Gen 36,34; Jer 49,20. Paran: Gen 21,21; Num 13,26; 1 Kgs 11,18; etc.

⁽⁶⁴⁾ Cf. CLIFFORD, *Cosmic Mountain*, 119.

⁽⁶⁵⁾ The same supposition in DE VAUX, *Histoire*, 399.

⁽⁶⁶⁾ Exod 19,3a.10-19; 20,18-20 may belong to the original description of the Sinaitic theophany. Other elements in Exod 19 are either "Deutero-

to the mountain-of-God tradition, elements such as serving God with offerings and feasts, and the relationship with the Midianites, apparently were pushed into the background.

On the other hand the transformation also gave rise to a tremendous literary accretion — in which certainly many old materials were involved. Mount Sinai became *the* place of Torah and covenant, the centre which attracted all kinds of motifs, traditions and precepts, with the extensive Priestly complexes between Exod 24 and Num 10 as a culmination. In these additions as redacted now Moses' part was very important.

5. The transition from the old tradition layer to the "Sinaitic" version is not a smooth one. Exod 19,1-2 are the introduction to this version. V.1, sometimes v.2a, are ascribed to P, v.2b mostly to an Elohist author. V. 1, characteristically opening with a definition of time⁽⁶⁷⁾, appears to belong indeed to the Priestly elements. This verse, like other chronological annotations, has a somewhat proleptic character (cf. Exod 40,17-18; Num 10,11 ff.)⁽⁶⁸⁾. It is plausible that in v.2 the Priestly redactor has taken up elements of an already existing text. V.2b, which differs from v.1 (*b'ne' yiśrā'ēl*) in that it is in singular, is probably part of this older text; the same may hold for the second part of v.2aα. If this is correct, we have an older introduction which, formulated after a pattern that is also used in Exod 19,2, goes as follows: *wayyābō' ū midbar sīnay... wayyiḥan-šām yiśrā'ēl neḡed hāhār*. In this introduction *hāhār* evokes a memory of the mountain of God in 18,5 and of Horeb in 17,6. At the same time the *narrativi* are not altogether clear. They can be understood to the effect that the geographic situation is reiterated and specified. One can also consider them implying a new stage of the desert sojourn, but then one has to ask oneself how, actually, the

monic" (vv.3b-6), or deviate in their contents or terminology (v.9a), or contain doublets or obvious complications (vv.7-8.9b, cf. 24,3; vv.20-25). Most of these elements may have been added afterwards. It is not quite evident that, as is often said, the thunders, lightnings and cloud of v.16 suppose another source than the smoke and the fire of v.18. Not only in Exod 20,18, but also in Pss 18,9.12ff.; 97,2-5 these phenomena are combined in a theophany description. Cf. G. I. DAVIES, *The Way of the Wilderness* (Cambridge 1979) 65-66.

⁽⁶⁷⁾ Cf. Gen 7,11; 8,13-14; Exod 16,1; 40,17; Num 10,11.

⁽⁶⁸⁾ See E. ZENGER, *Die Sinaitheophanie* (Würzburg 1971) 56.

mountain of Exod 19,2 relates to that of 18,5. The ambiguity seems to be characteristic of the "Sinaitic" version following now, which partly links up with the older story, partly deviates from it. As a result of the Priestly addition about the departure from Rephidim (v.2a), the breach in the narrative becomes rather more acute.

6. The junction of the mountain of God and "Sinai", as it appears from Exod 19 on, is presupposed in the Deuteronomic literature. Here, however, the name Horeb is used again. The reason for it might simply be that "Mount Sinai" was still too unfamiliar a designation of the old mountain of God⁽⁶⁹⁾.

VI

It is remarkable that the narrative of Exod 17,1-7, preceding the sojourn at Sinai, is located at "Massah and Meribah" (v.7); Meribah is connected with Kadesh⁽⁷⁰⁾, a place which, according to Num 13,26, is only reached much later. This has been a principal reason for suggesting that the whole journey to the mountain is a later datum. In Wellhausen's words⁽⁷¹⁾: "Indessen scheint es, als ob die Wallfahrt zum Sinai in der ältesten Sage überhaupt keine Stelle gehabt habe. Es schimmert eine Form derselben durch, wonach die Israeliten sofort nach dem Ausbruch aus Ägypten auf Kades zogen (...) Unnatürlich genug ist die Digression nach einem Punkte, der so weit von dem eigentlichen Ziel der Ausgewanderten ablag". It is often assumed that Exod 17 and 18, or even the accounts from Exod 15,22 on, and possibly Num 11-12 as well, were originally connected with Kadesh.

This hypothesis, which considers the Sinai complex a later insertion into the Kadesh tradition, is clearly at variance with the above view, in which the Sinai complex has a secondary place within the mountain-of-God tradition. The arguments on which it rests, however, are not decisive.

⁽⁶⁹⁾ See Deut 1,2.6.19; 4,10.15; 5,2; 9,8; 18,16; 28,69. For another suggestion see PERLITT, "Sinai und Horeb".

⁽⁷⁰⁾ See e.g. Num 20,1.13; Deut 32,51; Ezek 48,28.

⁽⁷¹⁾ WELLHAUSEN, *Geschichte*⁸, 12. See also e.g. H. H. ROWLEY, *From Joseph to Joshua* (London ²1951) 105-106.

1. It is likely that Kadesh was important in older traditions of the wilderness journey. On the other hand, an open-minded reading of the texts mentioned of Exodus and Numbers hardly anywhere shows real indications of an original connection with that place. In point of fact, nearly all the arguments adduced especially by Gressmann⁽⁷²⁾ are to a greater or lesser degree speculative.

Exod 17,1-7, of course, is striking⁽⁷³⁾. V.1 names the place of action Rephidim in a context which — this at least goes for v.1a — strongly reminds one of Priestly texts⁽⁷⁴⁾. V.7 has “Massah and Meribah”; because a parallel story is set at Meribat-Kadesh (Num 20,1-13), this is mostly considered to be the original location. The question is whether the argument is right. It is important to pay attention to v.2 and v.3, which are clearly doublets. Noth⁽⁷⁵⁾ is of the opinion that v.2 (with *rīb*) has the oldest version. He furthermore assumes that “Massah” in v. 7 has afterwards been added to “Meribah” (cf. Deut 33,8; Ps 95,8); which in turn would imply that the statements about “trying” in vv.2.7 are secondary as well. This, all in all, is pretty complicated. We may rather simplify the picture by assuming that v.2 is secondary, not v.3. The text then runs as follows: Israel “encamped at Rephidim, but there was no water for the people to drink. The people thirsted there for water and murmured against Moses, saying, Why have you brought me⁽⁷⁶⁾ up out of Egypt, to let me with my children and my cattle die of thirst? So Moses cried to YHWH: What shall I do with these people? In a moment they will be stoning me!” Moses’ cry for help in v.4 fits better with v.3 than with v.2. Also *šām* of v.3 links up well with

(72) See GRESSMANN, *Mose und seine Zeit*, 123-124, 130-133, 140-143, 155, 161, 164-171, 177-178, 256-257, 266, 273. The occurrence of *nsh pi’el* in Exod 15,25; 16,4 (cf. 17,2.7) appears to be the most striking argument. Exod 20,20 however proves that, at least at a later time, the word was not only used in connection with Massah. Moreover, it is not quite certain that of old Massah was located at Kadesh; cf. Deut 9,22.

(73) See also above, IV, 1.

(74) *kol-’ādat b’nē-yiśrā’el*: see above, n. 14. *l’mas’ ēhēm ’al-pī yhw’*: cf. Num 9,18.20.23; 10,12.13.

(75) NOTH, *Das zweite Buch Mose*², 110-111. Likewise FRITZ, *Israel in der Wüste*, 48.

(76) In spite of the LXX the *lectio difficilior* with 1st sing. suffix is to be preferred in v.3. Instead of *hē’ēlītānū* we should then read *hē’ēlītānī*.

v.1b, which might be part of a pre-Priestly itinerary⁽⁷⁷⁾. "Rephidim" appears to be original then; it must have been a place not far from Horeb (v.6). V.2 probably came into the text in the wake of v.7, the latter having been added on account of the fact that the tradition of Exod 17,3-6 was also localized at Kadesh, i.e., at "Mas-sah and Meribah". The double name, apparently derived from poetical versions of the Wilderness tradition (Deut 33,8; Ps 95,8), may confirm the secondary character of the whole of v.7⁽⁷⁸⁾.

2. The stay at Horeb is a properly integrated element in precisely those texts speaking of a friendly relationship between Israel and the Midianites (see Exod 3,1.12; 18,5; also Num 10,29 ff.); as we saw, they must be part of an old tradition. It is reasonable to suppose that the holy mountain, where Moses had met God, was, in an earlier version too, Israel's provisional terminus. The presentation in chapter 18 gives the impression that the stay at the mountain had been foreseen (cf. Exod 3,12), and that the people sojourned there longer than at former encampment-sites.

3. It may be useful, in view of Wellhausen's remark on the "Digressus", to consider the geographical situation. It has often been noted that certain data in the story of the wilderness journey, such as the quail, the Amalekites (cf. Gen 14,7; Num 13,29; 1 Sam 15,7; 30) and the Midianites (cf. 1 Kgs 11,15-18), can be more easily linked with the northern part of the Sinai Peninsula than with the southern part⁽⁷⁹⁾. Most of these data are associated with places not very far from the mountain of God. In Deut 33,2 (cf. Judg 5,4-5; Hab 3,3) Sinai is mentioned together with Seir and Paran⁽⁸⁰⁾. All of this might imply that in an early stage of tradition the wilderness journey was thought to have been rather in the north, the distance between the mountain of God and Kadesh being thought not too

⁽⁷⁷⁾ On the growth of the "itinerary tradition" see G. W. COATS, "The Wilderness Itinerary", *CBQ* 34 (1972) 146-147.

⁽⁷⁸⁾ Cf. NICHOLSON, *Exodus and Sinai*, 27 n. 73.

⁽⁷⁹⁾ Cf. R. KITTEL, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel* I (Stuttgart 1932) 343-349; J. GRAY, "The Desert Sojourn of the Hebrews and the Sinai-Horeb Tradition", *VT* 4 (1954) 148-154; J. H. GRØNBÆK, "Juda und Amalek", *ST* 18 (1964) 26-45; HYATT, *Exodus*, 205-207.

⁽⁸⁰⁾ Cf. S. HERRMANN, *Geschichte Israels in alttestamentlicher Zeit* (München 1973) 102-103; B. MAZAR, "Yahweh came out from Sinai", in *Temples and High Places in Biblical Times* (Jerusalem 1981) 5-9.

great. It is imaginable that later on, when YHWH had established cult places in Canaan, the conception of the mountain of God literally receded. In the Old Testament nothing is said of regular pilgrimages to Horeb. On the other hand the relations with the Midianites had cooled down too much for keeping in touch through them with the ancient dwelling place of YHWH. This might possibly account for the fact that later Horeb and Kadesh were thought to be divided by a very great distance⁽⁸¹⁾.

VII

If it is assumed that a mountain-of-God tradition has been reshaped "Sinaitically", then the question arises whether in the Pentateuchal text as handed down something of the older stratum can be recovered.

Of course we may mention texts outside the Sinai complex in which the mountain of God has (or probably has) a place: Exod 3-4; 17,1b.3-6; 18; Num 10,29-33a. As to the Sinai complex, it is not easy to find criteria for recognizing the old version there, the less so because the old layer of tradition is certainly not homogeneous itself either. The best criterion appears to be the occurrence of the name Horeb or "mountain of God"⁽⁸²⁾. After Exod 18 we met this datum twice.

1. In Exod 33,6 there is question of *har hōrēb*, a combination which occurs only here. "And so the Israelites stripped themselves of their ornaments, from Mount Horeb onward"⁽⁸³⁾. The passage in question concerns YHWH's refusal to accompany Israel to the promised land, and in that connection Israel is called "a stiff-necked people" (vv.3.5). This terminology, which we meet further especially in Jeremiah and Deuteronomy, fits in well with the theological

⁽⁸¹⁾ Num 33,16-36; Deut 1,2.19; 1 Kgs 19,8.

⁽⁸²⁾ Of course there may be other elements pointing to an older stratum. I may mention here the announcement of Exod 19,9a, which is somewhat singular in its terminology (*'ab he' ānān*) and content. The words "and that they may also believe you for ever" remind one of Exod 4,1.8; 14,31. The text in question seems to be an erratic fragment.

⁽⁸³⁾ The preposition *min* is apparently used here in the same way as in *mibbeten 'immī* (Judg 16,17) and *merehem* (Job 3,11).

reflection upon a lengthy experience of God with Israel, and makes one think of a rather late period. Moreover vv.5b.6 appear to be secondary in relation to v.4. The words "Now put off your ornaments from you" do not agree with what was said in v.4, "no man put on his ornaments". The conclusion must be that probably Exod 33,6 is not original.

2. In Exod 24,13 the mountain of God, *har hā'ēlōhîm*, is mentioned. In my opinion vv.12-15a are an original unit⁽⁸⁴⁾. Here Moses is instructed to climb the mountain in order to receive the stone tables. He sets off with his servant, Joshua, but orders the elders to remain and wait.

It is said, but wrongly, that v.14, the instruction to the elders, does not fit in after the statement of v.13 that Moses went up the mountain. V.13 obviously means to say that Moses accepted the task (see *wayyāqom*). When after the words "and Moses went up the mountain" (consec. imperf.) we read "And he said to the elders..." (perf.), this is not contrary to Hebrew narrative style⁽⁸⁵⁾. As to the view that the appearance of Joshua, according to

⁽⁸⁴⁾ Vv.9-11 as well as vv.15b-18a offer a picture different from that of vv.12-15a. A striking difference between vv.9-11 and vv.12-15a affects the persons mentioned. In vv.9-11 the mention of Nadab and Abihu is still in another way remarkable: cf. Lev 10,1 ff.; Num 3,4. The fact that besides Moses others are admitted into YHWH's direct presence, is remarkable as well. The account in question, on the wordless *visio Dei* (E. W. NICHOLSON), is apparently a separate unit in the Sinai complex. The text may be younger than is often assumed; see E. RUPRECHT, "Exodus 24,9-11 als Beispiel lebendiger Erzähltradition aus der Zeit des babylonischen Exils", in *Werden und Wirken des Alten Testaments; Festschrift C. Westermann* (Göttingen 1980) 138-173. It was probably inserted here later than the Book of the Covenant and the account of Exod 24,3-8 (cf. above, n. 59). The insertion of vv.1-2 probably aims at uniting beforehand as closely as possible the covenant making, the *visio Dei*, and the receipt of the stone tables (in v.1 *wē'el-mōšeh*, put first, then contrasts with Israel, who was previously addressed). — In v.16 Moses is called "on the seventh day", after which he goes up the mountain (v.18): an information that does not quite agree with the instruction in v.12. The conception of the cloud which covers the mountain while the *kēbôd yhwē* is resting on it, links vv.15b-18a with texts that are reckoned among the Priestly tradition (cf. e.g. Exod 40,34-35; Lev 9,23; Num 9,22; 17,7).

⁽⁸⁵⁾ Similar cases in e.g. 1 Kgs 1,41; 22,30-31; 2 Kgs 4,30-31; Jer 36,20. Cf. W. SCHNEIDER, *Grammatik des Biblischen Hebräisch* (München 1974) § 48.2.2.

vv.13b.14a, would not agree with the instruction given to Moses in v.12⁽⁸⁶⁾, it betrays, I think, an all too great critical bias.

Quite interesting in Exod 24,12-15a are the persons who play a part beside Moses: Joshua, Aaron and Hur. They are exactly the same as those who play a part in the history of the battle against Amalek in Exod 17,8-16, a text certainly well rooted in the older layer of tradition. In both texts Aaron and Hur appear to be the ones who are closest to Moses and have most authority after him, while Joshua acts as Moses' servant carrying out his orders. The matter is the more remarkable because the Hur concerned is only mentioned in these two texts and nowhere else⁽⁸⁷⁾. The coincidence of the two elements, viz. the name "mountain of God" and the mention of the persons spoken of in Exod 17 (in similar roles) can scarcely be fortuitous. Its logical explanation is, I imagine, that Exod 24,12-15a is connected with the text of Exod 17 as a fragment of the older stratum.

This means that the older tradition already knew about stone tablets holding commandments⁽⁸⁸⁾, which Moses received on Horeb in order to "teach" Israel. So in the older stratum too the mountain of God had a significance of its own with regard to torah — which is logical after all⁽⁸⁹⁾.

Moses' receiving the tablets for teaching Israel in all probability has to do with his judicial function (cf. Exod 18,13-16)⁽⁹⁰⁾. As a

⁽⁸⁶⁾ W. BEYERLIN, *Herkunft und Geschichte der ältesten Sinaitraditionen* (Tübingen 1961) 20.

⁽⁸⁷⁾ Of course, in an earlier stage of tradition more will have been told of him.

⁽⁸⁸⁾ The combination 'et *luhot hā'eben wḥattôrāh wḥammišwāh* in v.12 is uncommon. Possibly *wḥattôrāh wḥammišwāh* is secondary; cf. 31,18; 32,15. See NOTH, *Das zweite Buch Mose*², 162; ZENGER, *Sinaitheophanie*, 77. Anyhow, there is no reason to doubt that the notion *luhot* implies the *tôrāh* and *mišwāh*.

⁽⁸⁹⁾ I think it cannot be ascertained whether this stratum spoke about a covenant made at the mountain. Num 10,33b mentions the "ark of the covenant of YHWH", but probably this element may not be reckoned to the "pre-Sinaitic" stratum. Since the ark seems here to have a function similar to that of Hobab in the preceding passage, v.33b is regarded as a deviating tradition.

⁽⁹⁰⁾ The more elaborate organization after Exod 18,17-26 is probably a somewhat younger element of tradition. Cf. R. KNIERIM, "Exodus 18 und die Neuordnung der mosaischen Gerichtsbarkeit", *ZAW* 73 (1961) 146-171.

judge he is temporarily replaced by Aaron and Hur, v.14: "Aaron and Hur are with you; whoever has a cause, let him go to them". It is remarkable, though, that this is said to the elders, who themselves often act as judges. Nöldeke⁽⁹¹⁾ already supposed, and probably rightly, that the text originally had *hā'ām* instead of *hazzēnīm*, and that the elders have been introduced in order to link up with vv.9-11. The text, as handed down, means to suggest that, in keeping with the presentation in vv.1-2, the elders remained waiting half-way up the mountain. Originally the ascent of the mountain in vv.12ff. will have been conceived as Moses' and Joshua's going up from the encampment-site (cf. chapter 32, where Aaron is not half-way up the mountain, but with the people in the camp).

3. It is clear that vv.12-15a are not complete in themselves. It is felt that they have a sequence in Exod 24,18b (the lengthy stay on the mountain) and subsequently in elements of 31,18 ("And he gave to Moses the tablets of stone, written with the finger of God")⁽⁹²⁾, whereafter follows the story of the golden calf and, among other things, the account of the second making of the tablets. In Exod 32 the word Sinai does not occur, only "the mountain" is mentioned; therefore it is not to be excluded that this chapter, at least the gist of it⁽⁹³⁾, is part of the older literary layer, or is an early addition to it⁽⁹⁴⁾. I think that, supporting this, v.15 may be considered, where it is said that the stone tablets were inscribed on both sides; this seems to indicate that the tablets contained more than the Ten Words written on them according to Deuteronomy (4,13; 5,22; 9,10; 10,4; cf. Exod 34,28). The idea that the tablets held the Decalogue may have originated from the oldest "Sinaitic" version, which presumably made the statement of Exod 24,12 follow after that of 20,21⁽⁹⁵⁾.

⁽⁹¹⁾ Th. NÖLDEKE, *Untersuchungen zur Kritik des Alten Testaments* (Kiel 1869) 53.

⁽⁹²⁾ See e.g. B. BAENTSCH, *Exodus-Leviticus-Numeri* (HKAT I/2; Göttingen 1903) 219; B. COUROYER, *L'Exode* (BJ; Paris 1958) 116, 147.

⁽⁹³⁾ At least vv.7-14 are regarded as a later addition.

⁽⁹⁴⁾ Cf. Ps 106,19 f.

⁽⁹⁵⁾ Cf. above, nn. 59, 84; also Deut 4,13-14; 5,22/19.

VIII

When asked how the "Sinaitization" of the stay at the mountain is to be dated, we can but speak with great reserve. Considering the "Sinaitic" version presupposed in Deuteronomy⁽⁹⁶⁾ does not help us very much further, because there is great difference of opinion about the date of that book. Yet the passages to which the Horeb episodes belong generally are dated not earlier than the 7th and not later than the 6th century. Another subject of consideration is the relationship to P, which complex, apart from the later additions, is dated in the 6th century or the first half of the 5th century. It is obvious that the "Sinaitic" version is presupposed in the Priestly writings too. On the other hand, as we have noticed, in several texts from the late pre-exilic or exilic periods, and possibly even in some post-exilic texts⁽⁹⁷⁾, the Sinai episode is still ignored as the very centre of the revelation of God's will.

From the above one may conclude that the "Sinaitic" version came into being about the 7th century, possibly somewhat earlier, but that it did not at once become an essential part of the current historical picture⁽⁹⁸⁾. It would appear that only after the exile this version acquired the canonical authority that is supposed in Nehemiah.

For the post-exilic Jewish community this was the completion of a rather important development. The image of the Sinaitic revelation, shaped from a profound experience of the holiness of God, was

⁽⁹⁶⁾ Cf. above, n. 69.

⁽⁹⁷⁾ See Pss 105; 135; 136.

⁽⁹⁸⁾ Cf. Jer 7,22-23; 11,3-4.7; 31,32; 34,13-14, where commandment and covenant are connected with the day that YHWH led the people out of Egypt. The phraseology of most of the passages concerned betrays the influence of a Deuteronomistic school or literature; in Jer 34,14 the commandment is largely worded as in Deut 15,1.12. Possibly, the broad reference to the exodus time (cf. *byôm* in e.g. Num 3,1) has been chosen because in the Deuteronomistic conception "words of the covenant" were not only spoken at Horeb, but in Transjordan as well; cf. Deut 4,45-46; 28,69; 29,24; 1 Kgs 8,21. All the same, this kind of reference may be rooted in the "pre-Sinaitic" situation (see above, II).

undoubtedly of great importance for a community which, ever more emphatically, grouped itself round the Torah. It is a remarkable thing, though, that (apart from the name Sinai) the later tenet that "Moses received the Torah from Sinai"⁽⁹⁹⁾ is included in what in Exodus appears to belong to the old tradition: "YHWH said to Moses, Come up to me on the mountain, and stay there; and I will give you the tablets of stone (...) which I have inscribed for teaching them" (Exod 24,12).

Vrije Universiteit
De Boelelaan 1105
1081 HV Amsterdam

Th. BOOIJ

SOMMAIRE

Le silence à propos des événements du Sinaï (Ex 19 ss) dans un nombre considérable de textes de l'A.T. a de quoi étonner. De plus, il arrive parfois que YHWH promulgue des commandements durant la période de l'exode d'une façon qui n'est pas habituelle dans le Pentateuque. En Ex 1-18, il y a encore d'autres éléments («montagne de Dieu», les Madianites, le «service de Dieu») qui trahissent une certaine «indiscipline» par rapports aux récits du Sinaï. Il semble que, à une époque relativement tardive, une tradition de la «montagne de Dieu» ait été modifiée et amplifiée en Ex 19ss. La nouvelle version «sinaïtique» fut inspirée par une conception de la théophanie que nous connaissons par exemple par Dt 33,2-5 et Jg 5,4-5.

⁽⁹⁹⁾ 'Abot 1,1. See also 'Abot de-Rabbi Natan 1,1.2 (reference to Deut 5,22/19).

Ez 17,1-10 como enigma y parábola*

Ez 17 puede ser considerado como un conjunto de tres unidades: vv.1-10, que llamaremos provisoriamente «fábula»; vv.11-21, la «interpretación política» de la fábula; y vv.22-24, la «interpretación teológica». Una sumaria lectura del texto y una cierta atención a la presencia de fórmulas de apertura y fórmulas conclusivas⁽¹⁾, justifica suficientemente esta división, sin que con ello se quiera afirmar una estricta unidad textual en cada una de las tres secciones⁽²⁾.

(*) Una versión reducida del presente estudio fué presentada al XI Congreso de la *International Organization for the Study of the Old Testament*, Salamanca, 28 de agosto — 2 de septiembre de 1983.

(1) La fórmula del acontecimiento de la palabra en vv.1.11, y la fórmula del mensajero en v.22, más la fórmula conclusiva en v.24 «Yo el Señor he hablado y lo he hecho» justifican la división básica del texto. La fórmula del mensajero en v.3 pertenece al esquema introductorio, que con pequeñas variantes se repite con frecuencia en Ezequiel: 13,2; 21,14; 30,2; 34,2. En v.9 la fórmula del mensajero introduce la apódosis del texto, como también ocurre en otros lugares de Ezequiel. En v.19 en cambio la fórmula del mensajero + *lākēn* y la fórmula de reconocimiento en v.21, más la masiva presencia de la primera persona de Yavé que anuncia su castigo, parecen delimitar una subsección. Véase nota(2).

(2) En la fábula Ez 17,1-10 solamente v.9bβ *w'lo' ... rāb* abandona completamente la imagen de la viña y del águila, y resulta extraño después de *tībāš*. Parecería una contaminación de v.17 y no pertenecería al mismo nivel de texto que la fábula. En vv.11-21 el núcleo de la interpretación política parece dado por vv.11-15ba. V.15bβ *w'hēpēr ... w'nimlāt* parece una glosa aclaratoria del destino efectivo de Sedecías, que quita las dudas dejadas por la elegante conclusión retórica de v.15ba. V.16 está en la misma línea de v.15bβ. La presencia de la expresión «quebrar el pacto» con el marcador de objeto *'et* puede ser signo de lenguaje del tardío post-exilio (cf. W. THIEL, «Hēfēr B'rīt. Zum Bundbrechen in Alten Testament», VT 20 [1970] 214-229, esp. p. 80). V.17 es una precisión histórica sobre la traición de Faraón. V.18 parece establecer un principio jurídico general: *ūbāzā* sería la prótasis, *yim-mālēt* la apódosis, y *w'hinnēh* debería ser leído como concesivo: «Quien ha despreciado un juramento, rompiendo el pacto; no obstante que había 'dado su palabra' ha hecho todas estas cosas; no debe quedar vivo». La expresión mantiene una gran semejanza con las sentencias judiciales de Ez 18,10-13. El

La historia de la interpretación de este texto permite constatar que la fábula ha sido habitualmente comprendida a partir de la «interpretación política»⁽³⁾. La afirmación de J. Garscha puede resumir

hecho particular se ha elevado a la categoría de principio general. Vv.19-21 son una interpretación, no de la fábula sino de la ruptura del pacto por parte del rey. El pacto y el juramento se convierten en «mi pacto» y «mi juramento». El castigo del rey y los suyos se convierte en explícita acción de Yavé. En vv.11-21 hemos pasado así sucesivamente de la aplicación política de la fábula, que concluye — como la fábula misma — con una pregunta (v.15bα), a la afirmación decidida del castigo, a la elevación de tal castigo a norma jurídica, y finalmente a la afirmación de la intervención de Yavé en el castigo. — Estas consideraciones bastan para la comprensión global del texto. Un estudio detallado de Ez 17,11-24 presenta F. HOSSFELD, *Untersuchungen zu Komposition und Theologie des Ezechielbuches* (FzB 20; Würzburg 1977) 59-98.

⁽³⁾ Véase por ejemplo, elegidos al azar: J. MALDONADO, *Commentarium in Ieremiam, Baruch, Ezechielem et Daniele* (Paris 1610) 423-427; L. TONDELLI, *Le profezie di Ezechiele* (Reggio-Emilia 1930) 55-57; F. SPADAFORA, *Ezechiele* (La Sacra Bibbia VIII/2; Roma 1951) 140-145; G. FOHRER, *Ezechiel* (HAT 13; Tübingen 1955) 94-97; ALONSO SCHÖCKEL L. — SICRE, J. L., *Profetas* (Madrid 1980) II, 739-740. — W. Zimmerli y W. Eichrodt en sus comentarios garantizan cierta independencia a la fábula, y una cierta distancia temporal respecto de la interpretación. Pero de hecho la fábula es vista desde la interpretación, sin preguntarse si tiene sentido independientemente de vv.11-21 + 22-24. G. HÖLSCHER, *Hesekiel. Der Dichter und das Buch* (BZAW 39; Giessen 1924) 97-102, fiel a su principio de atribuir al profeta solamente «textos poéticos», defiende la total independencia de vv.1-10, pero no proporciona una interpretación del texto: «... das Gedicht ist... in sich so durchsichtig, dass es einer Deutung gar nicht bedarf» (p. 101).

El estudio más sugestivo de Ez 17,1-10 que ha caído en mis manos es el de B. LANG, *Kein Aufstand in Jerusalem. Die Politik des Propheten Ezechiel* (SBB; Stuttgart 1978) 28-49. Lang en efecto «no está lejos de la verdad». Su esfuerzo por leer la fábula en sí misma le ha permitido, vgr. deshacerse de la ecuación 'ereš kēna'an igual «Babilonia»; traducir zera' hā'āreš por «kleiner Steckling», y no como habitualmente «Same des Landes», que favorece una lectura alegorizante; y sobre todo, le ha permitido entrever la importancia de la pregunta retórica *hātišlāḥ* (p. 47). Sin embargo Lang ha quedado atrapado en la concepción alegórico-política, condicionado tal vez por el tema general de su estudio: «Der Text handelt nicht eigentlich von Adlern und Pflanzen: hinter diesen verbergen sich politische Grössen, denn wir haben es mit einer politischen Allegorie zu tun, die wesentlich von der Sache her konzipiert ist» (p. 29). Con este punto de partida, su erudita fundamentación, por medio de abundantes paralelos literarios e iconográficos del Antiguo Cercano y Medio Oriente, de posibles connotaciones de los términos importantes de la fábula (águila; cedro; vid/viña; disputa de las águilas por la vid) se resiente

esta situación: «La contraposición entre alegoría e interpretación nos permite suponer que la alegoría en su estado actual no ha existido sin la interpretación, sino que más bien desde el comienzo ha sido vista desde la interpretación»⁽⁴⁾.

de parcialidad. Lang asume las connotaciones — a veces forzadamente, como cuando trata del águila en el AT, o cuando explica la figura 2, pp. 42, 44 — que favorecen la lectura política; mantiene las dos águilas sin someterlas a una consideración crítica, que debería comenzar por la sintaxis. Para explicar la relación entre la exportación de madera de cedro realizada por el conquistador babilonio, y la plantación del brote de vid, Lang debe renunciar a la lectura de las imágenes, que ha intentado parcialmente, y refugiarse en la interpretación alegórica. El intento de justificar *in extremis* (las tres últimas páginas de su exposición) la «efectividad didáctica» de la alegoría (contra Jülicher) y por tanto su sentido en Ez 17,1-10 no parece logrado.

⁽⁴⁾ *Studien zum Ezechielbuch*. Eine redaktionskritische Untersuchung von Ez 1-39 (Europäische Hochschulschriften 23/23; Frankfurt 1974) 29. — La terminología frecuente «alegoría» e «interpretación» de Garscha y de otros tantos autores (vgr. W. ZIMMERLI, *Ezechiel* [BK 13/1; Neukirchen 1969] 378: «Zudem ist die Fabel in Ez 17 schon stark mit allegorisierenden Zügen durchsetzt») es poco feliz. Ella supone que Ez 17,1-10 ha sido compuesto con la intención de ser leído desde la «interpretación» (Ez 17,12-15? o 17,12-21? o 17,22-24?), lo cual está lejos de haber sido demostrado.

Apoyado en el interesante (pero poco sistemático) estudio de C. BOUSÑO, *El irracionalismo poético. El símbolo* (Madrid 1981) 69, definiría la alegoría como el modo de discurso por el cual se establece una correspondencia término a término entre un evocante y un evocado. Una determinada realidad, (objeto, proceso o situación) me evoca (y por eso lo llamo evocante) otra realidad (persona, objeto, proceso, situación), al cual llamo evocado. Por ejemplo, una serpiente podría evocar una mujer. Si el sujeto-autor hace corresponder término a término las cualidades reales o presuntas de evocante y evocado (escamas-impenetrabilidad; veneno-malicia; viscosidad-incomprensibilidad; velocidad-sutileza) contruye una alegoría, que se convierte en una unidad textual indisoluble. No es posible separar en ella la *Bildhälfte* de la *Sachhälfte*. Por el contrario, la yuxtaposición de dos unidades textuales, una de tipo imaginativo (*Bildrede*) y la otra, declaración conceptual en cierta relación a la primera, no implica aún una alegoría, sino solamente una explicación alegorizante de un texto, que no necesariamente acierta con la intención del texto imaginativo. Cuando se piensa en determinadas explicaciones del AT o del NT la distinción entre alegoría y explicación alegórica resulta evidente. Véase en este sentido últimamente E. ARENS, *Kommunikative Handlungen*. Die paradigmatische Bedeutung der Gleichnisse Jesu für eine Handlungstheorie (Düsseldorf 1982) 368-371. — Que ya dentro del texto sacro existan interpretaciones alegorizantes no debe extrañar. Es casi la normal reacción defensiva del lector ante un texto imaginativo, que no revela su sentido

La lectura política de la fábula se justifica con la correlación existente entre los elementos de la fábula y los de la interpretación política, una correlación con frecuencia apoyada más sobre el contenido — y que por consiguiente *supponit quod erat demonstrandum* — que sobre elementos léxicos objetivos⁽⁵⁾.

Esta manera de leer la fábula presenta una serie de dificultades:

a) No es suficiente el argumento de la correlación para establecer que la fábula en su estado actual⁽⁶⁾ no pudo existir independientemente de las interpretaciones. Es evidente que toda interpretación debía referirse necesariamente a algunos elementos de ella y utilizarlos en la aplicación. La correlación no prejuzga ni en favor ni en contra de la existencia independiente de la fábula, porque es el resultado — no el fundamento — de una determinada interpretación de la fábula.

b) Tampoco es claro por qué siempre se supone que la auténtica interpretación de la fábula es la política, y no la teológica. Obviamente no se puede arguir a partir de la cantidad de expresiones comunes a la fábula y a alguna de las interpretaciones. Tal argumento favorecería en todo caso la interpretación teológica. Tampoco se puede arguir a partir de la precedencia textual de la interpretación

inmediatamente. La alegoría, por lo demás, no es la única manera posible de relación entre evocante y evocado. La metáfora y la parábola son otros modos posibles de tal relación. Véase más abajo la nota 7 y la interpretación de Ez 17,1-10 que propongo.

(5) J. KÖNIG, en sus notas a la traducción de Ez 17,3 en *La Bible, II. L'Ancien Testament* (Bibliothèque de la Pléiade; Paris 1959) 488, puede servir de ejemplo de la manera habitual de tratar la fábula: «L'aigle représente Nabuchodonosor... Le cèdre figure la maison royale de Juda ou ce royaume lui même. La cime du cèdre est Joachin...». Y a propósito de v.5: «La semence représente Sédécias installé sur le trône de Juda comme vassal du roi de Babylonne...».

(6) Algunos autores postulan una existencia independiente de un estadio anterior de la fábula. Esa pre-existencia explicaría tensiones aún perceptibles entre fábula e interpretación. Ez 19,10-14 vgr. sería testimonio del estadio previo de la fábula (cfr. GARSCHA, *Studien*, 44; LANG, *Kein Aufstand*, 40-41). Nótese que no nos interesa aquí la posible independencia histórica de la fábula, en su estadio actual o en uno anterior (*Vorlage*), sino solamente la exigencia que manifiesta la fábula — como toda parábola — de ser interpretada en sí misma previamente a la lectura de las «interpretaciones oficiales» (del AT) de tal texto.

política respecto de la teológica; ni es evidente el principio general de que una amenaza de castigo deba preceder siempre una promesa de restauración.

c) La única razón suficiente que se podría aducir para escribir una compleja fábula, si junto con ella se propone inmediatamente una minuciosa interpretación, es que la fábula tiene la única función de atraer la atención de los lectores o auditores y despertar su curiosidad, preparando la interpretación que inmediatamente sigue. En este caso estaríamos frente a la concepción didáctica de la parábola y la metáfora — que, como lo han mostrado los estudios de los últimos años, no hace justicia a la naturaleza de ambas formas literarias⁽⁷⁾.

(7) La fuerza del argumento la notaba ya HÖLSCHER, *Hesekiel*, 101: «Wäre die Deutung ursprünglich, so wäre das Gedicht überflüssig und reine Spielerei». Recuérdese que las fábulas propiamente tales, como las conocemos de Fedro, Esopo o La Fontaine, no tienen una «interpretación», sino simplemente una moraleja, que explicita en un principio general el comportamiento de los personajes, sin especificar quién es la zorra y qué cosa son las uvas. Tal moraleja ni siquiera sería necesaria para el lector inteligente y atento, de tal modo es plástica la fábula en el mostrar determinadas actitudes. Sería posible sin gran dificultad mostrar cómo fábula y parábola coinciden en su estructura profunda. La fábula no sería sino una parábola donde los actantes son animales. — La concepción de parábola que suppongo en este estudio es fundamentalmente la expuesta por P. RICOEUR en su magnífico estudio «Biblical Hermeneutics», *Semeia* 4 (1975) 27-148, en particular pp. 75-106, «The Metaphorical Process». La parábola es definida allí como «el modo de discurso que aplica a una forma narrativa un proceso metafórico» (p. 88). Este proceso metafórico establece y al mismo tiempo resuelve parcialmente la tensión existente entre dos lecturas absolutamente posibles de la forma narrativa concreta. Pero a diferencia de la metáfora, en la parábola ninguna de las lecturas posibles es contradictoria o semánticamente irrelevante.

En la parábola no hay tensión entre las diferentes lecturas posibles a nivel de significado inmanente al texto, sino a nivel de los posibles referentes globales. Ez 17 tiene un inmediato referente global (cedro, vid, ramas, crecimiento, entrelazados con la acción del águila). Pero hay otro referente implícito aludido: los seres libres que deciden en un sentido o en otro, aun en contra de sus verdaderos intereses profundos.

Interpretar una parábola significa abrir la inteligencia de estos posibles referentes implícitos, que obviamente no tienen nombre ni apellido. Interpretar la parábola de los viñadores homicidas del NT no significa descubrir

d) La dificultad anterior resulta aún más grave si se considera que la fábula de Ez 17 no prepara la interpretación; más bien desorienta al lector. En ella se insiste en cuatro elementos, las raíces, las aguas abundantes, el suelo favorable y el «ser plantado», que ulteriormente no son retomados en la interpretación.

No parece, pues, haber argumentos decisivos que obliguen a leer la fábula desde la interpretación; y parece en cambio que la exégesis ha hecho pocos esfuerzos para leer Ez 17,1-10 en sí mismo, procurando encontrar el sentido de la fábula en cuanto tal. Aún si se pudiera demostrar que fábula e interpretación han sido compuestas simultáneamente, con ello no se podría excluir que la fábula en sí misma tenga un sentido tal vez más rico, y aún diferente de cualquier interpretación particular, simultánea o posterior, incluyendo la eventual interpretación del autor mismo de la fábula.

Nuestra exposición procede por los siguientes pasos.

1. Se procura mostrar que algunas expresiones de la fábula, habiendo sido leídas desde la interpretación, han sido mal comprendidas, o aún manipuladas, a fin de hacerlas coincidir con la interpretación.

2. Se considera la imagen de la tierra fértil y las aguas abundantes, que en la fábula aparece en primer plano, y en cambio no tiene ninguna importancia en las interpretaciones.

3. Se sugiere una interpretación de conjunto de la fábula en sí misma.

4. Se procura resolver una dificultad principal.

5. Se intenta clarificar el sentido de *māšāl* y *hîdâ* en Ez 17,1-10.

quién era el propietario que una vez envió su hijo para cobrar el arrendamiento de la viña, ni cuál era el monto del arrendamiento, sino cuál es el referente global que se oculta detrás del referente evidente. Puesto que la trama (el «plot») es esencial a la narración, y puesto que la parábola es una narración, el sentido de la parábola debe ser buscado en la trama misma, en la interacción de los personajes, y no en la identidad de cada uno de ellos considerado separadamente. — Las objeciones que se han planteado a la interpretación de Ricoeur (véase vgr. ARENS, *Kommunikative Handlungen*, 24-30; 40-42), más que invalidar sus puntos de vista, ponen de relieve la necesidad de completarlos. Para la finalidad de este artículo, la concepción de Ricoeur es suficientemente válida.

1. Las expresiones manipuladas.

a) *QTP* (en el AT: Ez 17,4,22; Dtn 23,26; Job 8,12; 30,4) no es «desarraigar» o «quebrar», como se esperaría si la imagen estaba destinada a introducir la alusión de Ez 17,12 al rey de Israel, violentamente depuesto, aislado de su pueblo, y llevado al cautiverio. *QTP* es un verbo casi técnico, que designa la recolección de los frutos de la cosecha. Es un «recoger» útil para quien lo efectúa, que debe ser realizado en el tiempo oportuno (Job 8,12). Implica pues orden y madurez. En este sentido positivo lo ha comprendido Ez 17,22, donde un brote es recogido para ser plantado delicadamente. Cualquier connotación de violencia está excluida en este verbo.

b) La identificación de *'ereš kēna'an* con Babilonia está sugerida por Ez 17,12, «los condujo... a Babilonia», y apoyada exclusivamente por Ez 16,29, donde la expresión queda aclarada por *kašdîmâ*. La expresión paralela «ciudad de mercaderes» no tiene connotación geográfica alguna. Puede referirse a mercaderes, sin ulterior explicitación (Cant 3, 6; 1Re 10,15) o a mercaderes de diferentes regiones (Ez 27,13.15.17.22.23.24). No se puede excluir la posibilidad de que *'ereš kēna'an* en Ez 17,4 quiera significar verdaderamente «la tierra de Canaán»⁽⁸⁾.

c) La imagen de la viña *sōraḥat* y *siplat qômâ* no coincide simplemente con la *mamlākâ šepālâ* de v.14. Los técnicos saben que una viña rastrera en determinados climas puede ser una viña excelente⁽⁹⁾. La expresión no implica tono peyorativo alguno.

d) *ʾšorāsâw/taḥtâw yihyû* («sus raíces debajo de él»)⁽¹⁰⁾ en v.6a

⁽⁸⁾ Como lo ha notado correctamente LANG, *Kein Aufstand*, 30.

⁽⁹⁾ Véase la información necesaria en GARSCHA, *Studien*, 29 nota 85, y en LANG, *Kein Aufstand*, 31, aquí sin referencia al posible sentido de tal viña «rastrera».

⁽¹⁰⁾ La propuesta de LANG, *Kein Aufstand*, 28, «hacia abajo», parece fruto de perplejidad, y no está justificada. — Los sufijos masculinos de *dalît* en vv.6.7 y de *šoreš* plantean una dificultad, ya que la *vid* (*gepen*) es tratada regularmente como femenino. Pero no se puede resolver pensando en una referencia a *zera'*, que ha quedado demasiado lejos (v.5); suena además extraño hablar de las ramas o las raíces de una «semilla». Una construcción *ad sensum*, refiriéndose al rey-semilla-vid de v.13 supone la interpretación que rechazamos. Hay que aceptar probablemente una cierta negligencia gramatical del autor, o descuido de copistas. En el mismo sentido habrá que

es comprendido habitualmente como una alusión a la sumisión al águila-Babilonia. Pero la expresión puede significar simplemente que «tenía sus raíces justamente allí», i.e., que estaba profundamente enraizada. De la misma manera se dice que alguien murió *tahtâw* (2 Sam 2,23), justamente donde estaba, o que nadie se movía *mit-tahtâw* (Ex 10,23) «de donde se encontraba» (cf. también Jos 5,6). La expresión obviamente no es informativa (¿dónde puede uno morir sino en el lugar donde se encuentra?) sino enfática. El sentido de dependencia en *tahtâw* no es, pues, el único posible ni parece recomendarse aquí, independientemente de la interpretación política.

e) La «segunda águila» impresiona como una invención de traductores (comenzando por la Septuaginta) y comentaristas, buscando el elemento correspondiente al Egipto de v.15 en la interpretación política. Diferentes observaciones hacen sospechosa la existencia de esta «segunda águila». Mientras en la interpretación política Egipto ocupa un puesto secundario — una marginal explicación de la infidelidad del rey de Judá a Babilonia — el águila de v.7 asume una función similar (¿o idéntica?) a la de la primera águila. Además, la insistencia de v.3 en la grande águila parece no dejar espacio literario para introducir en medio de la fiesta una segunda águila, con los mismos atributos de la primera, con excepción de *'erek hā'ēber* y *hāriqmā*. Pero sobre todo, el texto no habla de un águila *'ahēr* sino *'ehād*. Y aunque la confusión gráfica sea posible, mientras *'ehād* sea explicable debe ser preferido⁽¹⁾.

'ehād en efecto tiene también el sentido intensivo de «único». En Dtn 17,6 se prohíbe condenar a muerte bajo el testimonio de *un único* testigo; en Ez 37,22 las promesas de Yavé incluyen la formación de *un único* pueblo bajo el mandato de *un único* rey. Y sobre todo, en Dtn 6,4, la profesión de fe de Israel establece que «Yavé nuestro Dios es *YHWH 'ehād*». Ez 17,7 por tanto completa el pensamiento de vv.3-6. Mientras vv.3-5 estaban centrados en la acción

aceptar las formas masculinas de *NTQ* y *QSS* con sujeto *gepen*, como propongo más abajo. Por otras razones M. Dahood habría aceptado las formas *ynattēq* y *yqōsēs* como femeninas.

(¹) ZIMMERLI, *Ezechiel*, 374, ha procurado salvar el sentido «otro» reteniendo la lectura *'ehād*. La expresión correlativa uno-otro (*'ehād-'ehād*) presente en Ez 19,5; 37,16 podría prescindir del primer *'ehād*. Pero la propuesta no parece apoyada por ningún otro caso.

del águila respecto de la viña, y en v.6 en el crecimiento de ésta, ahora se explicita — solamente ahora — la relación de la viña con la única águila, hacia la cual tiende sus raíces. *w^hinnēh* en v.7b debería ser considerado como un resultativo⁽¹²⁾. Siendo *way^hhī* en v.7 un modificador temporal intraducible, el sentido del verso sería el siguiente:

«Aquella (única) águila era grande... etc. y por ello esta viña...».

V.7b explicita pues el estrecho vínculo que se ha establecido entre el águila y la viña. V.8 reitera la acción del águila en favor de la viña.

f) En v.9 causa dificultad determinar el sujeto de los verbos activos *NTQ* y *QSS*. La lectura política de la fábula ve como sujeto la primera águila (= Babilonia), que castiga al rey de Judá. Sintácticamente no hay, sin embargo, ninguna razón para considerar sujeto de ambos verbos un águila que ha desaparecido a partir de v.6. Es más coherente considerar como sujeto la viña misma, sujeto también de los verbos intransitivos *SLH* y *YŠB* en v.9. Esta propuesta se ve reforzada por la significación prevalente de *NTQ piel*: romper una cadena o cuerda, en sentido propio (Sansón, en Jue 16,9.12) o figurado (Ps 2,3; 107,14), sea que se trate de Israel que se libera de sus enemigos (Nah 1,13), o procura liberarse de la obediencia a Yavé (Jer 2,20; 5,5). La cuestión que se plantea en v.9 es por tanto: ¿No procurará la viña liberar sus raíces de toda atadura? La acción está vista no desde el presunto enemigo (primera águila=Babilonia) sino desde la viña misma.

El verbo *QSS*, siendo un hápax, debería ser traducido de algún modo en paralelo a *NTQ*.

La sumaria investigación realizada procurando leer algunos de los términos problemáticos en sí mismos, prescindiendo de la interpretación política, nos hace entrever un sentido diferente del texto. Esta impresión se acentúa cuando consideramos los elementos que la interpretación política ha descuidado.

(12) Cfr. D. J. MCCARTHY, «The Uses of *w^hinnēh* in Biblical Hebrew», *Bib* 61(1980) 330-342, esp. p. 340.

2. *La imagen olvidada.*

Las cuatro expresiones: raíces (vv.6.7.9, 2 veces), aguas abundantes (vv.5.8), suelo favorable (*bišdēh-zāra'* v.5; *'ārugā* vv.7.10; *šādeh tōb* v.8), ser plantado (vv.8.10), de las cuales solamente la última es retomada, y no en la interpretación política sino en la teológica (vv.22.23), constituyen en realidad junto con el águila una única imagen. El águila ha plantado solícitamente la semilla en un terreno favorable, junto a aguas abundantes, de tal manera que pudiera echar raíces profundas. Consideremos los elementos de la imagen.

a) *neser* puede significar simplemente el águila, que como los demás animales, caen bajo las disposiciones de Dios (Job 39,27). Lev 11,13 sitúa el águila entre los animales impuros que no se pueden comer. Por su velocidad el águila puede ser término de comparación de los días que vuelan (Job 9,26), o de la nación que ataca veloz y terriblemente (Dtn 28,49). Por la altura a la cual se eleva el águila es signo del orgullo (Jer 49,16). Pero teniendo cuenta de la totalidad de sus atributos (fuerza, velocidad, altura, invencibilidad), es lógico que el águila pueda ser símbolo también de Yavé. En Ex 19,4 («habéis visto... cómo os he llevado sobre alas de águilas y os he hecho venir a mí») no sería difícil explicitar la asociación entre Yavé y el águila. Es lo que ha hecho Dtn 32,11. Yavé es como

«un águila que vigila su nido
planea sobre sus crías
extiende sus alas, las toma,
las lleva sobre su plumaje».

Esta es la interpretación que Ez 17,22-23 ha dado al águila. Es verdad que un águila-jardinero es una inconsueta imagen para Yavé (¡pero no lo es menos para el rey de Babilonia y Faraón!). De todas maneras no afirmamos que el águila de Ez 17,1-10 sea Yavé (en la fábula leída en sí misma, cada elemento no es disfraz de otro) sino que la figura del águila en el AT connota más directamente Yavé que los reyes de Babilonia o Egipto.

b) Una clarificación del sentido del motivo del agua en esta imagen puede proporcionar Ez 31,2-9, que presenta numerosos contactos en su vocabulario con Ez 17,1-10 y es más explícito que éste.

En 31,2-9 el Faraón-Egipto es comparado (*'el-mî damîṭā*, «¿a quién te asemejabas?», v.2) con un magnífico cedro, con bello follaje, fuertes ramas y abundante sombra, capaz de cobijar aves y animales — y en una tácita trasposición del cedro a Faraón-Egipto — también numerosos pueblos. Por tres veces en vv.4.5.7 se indica que las *mayim* (*rabbîm* 2 veces) son la causa del crecimiento extraordinario del cedro. V.7 precisa: la belleza del cedro se debe a que «su raíz estaba dirigida hacia las aguas abundantes». Vv.10-13 integran motivos que se refieren al cedro con otros que se refieren a Faraón/Egipto para describir el castigo que cae sobre él. La razón del castigo la da v.10, aludiendo simultáneamente al cedro y a Faraón:

«porque ha puesto su cima por encima de las nubes y se ha inflado su corazón por su altura».

Pero el castigo debe servir de ejemplo a todos los *ašēmayim* («árboles de agua»! v.14), que en el mismo verso son llamados *sōtē mayim* (bebedores de agua; cf. v.16). Los demás árboles deben aprender que no es suficiente estar alimentados de aguas abundantes para pretender alzar su cima hasta las nubes.

Junto al motivo formal del castigo, el texto parece implicar por tanto que las aguas abundantes son corresponsables de la *hybris* del cedro; o al menos que la última razón del orgullo, que desencadena el castigo, es el haber puesto una confianza total en las aguas fecundantes, sin recordar que todos los árboles estaban condenados al Sheol y a la muerte (v.14). V.5 sugiere que también las aguas participan en el castigo (¿o solamente en el duelo?) del cedro.

Con excepción de v.9, en Ez 31 todo el proceso de crecimiento está considerado con independencia de Yavé. Si se tiene en cuenta la connotación de poder enemigo de Yavé que las «aguas abundantes» tienen frecuentemente⁽¹³⁾, resulta muy verosímil que el texto quiera implicar un antagonismo entre Yavé señor de la creación por una parte, y cedro/fuentes de agua por otra.

En Ez 17,1-10 el antagonismo se sitúa entre el águila / las aguas, que el águila ha puesto a disposición del cepo, y el viento del este

(13) Véase la sumaria información que propongo en «La teodicea del Deuterocanónico», *Bib* 62(1981) 58. Nótese sin embargo que las «aguas abundantes» de Ez 17,5.8 integran la imagen de fertilidad.

(*ru^{ah} haqqādīm* v.10). El cedro / el cepo de viña son objeto de una disputa y sujeto de una decisión. Mientras en Ez 31 la decisión ya ha sido tomada (el cedro optó por las aguas, pensando encontrar en ellas toda la fuerza necesaria para alzarse hasta las nubes), en Ez 17,1-10 la decisión está todavía abierta. El texto concluye sobre una pregunta, repetida y formulada de diversos modos.

3. *El sentido de la fábula.*

Ez 17,1-10 puede ser leído en sí mismo, ya que presenta un sentido completo. Esto no excluye que tal sentido esté abierto a ulteriores interpretaciones.

Había una vez un águila que había cortado delicadamente la cima de un cedro del Líbano, lo llevó a la tierra de Canaán, ciudad/país de comerciantes, y allí lo depuso. Cogió también un cepo de viña y lo plantó en un campo fértil, con las mejores condiciones. Y de hecho la semilla se convirtió en una viña magnífica, según las previsiones del águila-jardinero (v.8 repite sumariamente las condiciones favorables que habían sido previstas).

La composición alcanza su clímax en vv.9-10. ¿Tendrá éxito, finalmente, esta viña? ¿No querrá más bien cortar sus propias raíces, que la unen al agua vivificante, no destruirá sus propios frutos, y se secará? Nótese que todas las proposiciones principales en vv.9-10, con excepción de v.10aa (*w^hinnēh s^tūlā*), que suena como un nostálgico lamento («y ella había sido plantada» en las mejores condiciones), son interrogativas: el primer *hālō'* ejerce su influjo sobre todo el verso 9b⁽¹⁴⁾; y el segundo sobre todo el verso 10b. En el centro queda la angustiada pregunta: *hātiṣlah*. En sintonía con éste, el *tiṣlah* de v.9a debería leerse también como interrogativo, como lo han comprendido G, S y V.

La afirmación central del texto es pues... una pregunta. ¿Es posible que una viña, destinada a la vida, cometa suicidio, corte sus propias raíces, apartándolas del agua y se condene a muerte por el viento del desierto? El interrogativo enfático *hālō'* espera una respuesta positiva. Sí, es posible. El texto piensa, probablemente, tam-

⁽¹⁴⁾ Con excepción de v.9b *w^olo' ... rāb*, que difícilmente puede pertenecer al mismo nivel de texto. Cfr. nota 2.

bién en Israel, la viña de Yavé⁽¹⁵⁾. Pero no es imposible que Ezequiel, profeta de la responsabilidad individual, esté pensando también en individuos particulares. Y está pensando, ciertamente, como en otros textos, en el misterio de la libertad humana delante de Dios. Así como el cedro-Egipto tenía también las condiciones favorables, pero pecó de soberbia, poniendo su confianza en las aguas que lo nutrían, sin pensar en el dador del agua, así también esta viña puede pecar de independencia, queriendo liberarse de las aguas que ella considera una atadura, y sin embargo son su fuente de vida.

Obviamente este sentido universal de la fábula permitía múltiples interpretaciones más concretas. Una de ellas era contraponer las aguas vivificantes de Yavé a los poderes de los soberanos de la tierra, viento del desierto. Y es posible que este pensamiento esté a la base de la interpretación política, vv.12b-15⁽¹⁶⁾, bien que ella ha alegorizado selectivamente algunos de los términos de la fábula⁽¹⁷⁾.

Otra posible interpretación era la teológico-ética de vv.22-24: si Yavé no planta y da el crecimiento, ¿quién podrá hacerlo? En sus manos está determinar quién crece, y quién no. La insistencia de los verbos en primera persona con sujeto Yavé no dejan duda sobre la intención del texto⁽¹⁸⁾.

5. *Un punto de conflicto.*

Ante la interpretación propuesta hay al menos un punto que queda en penumbras. Si el interés de Ez 17,1-10 está centrado en la

⁽¹⁵⁾ Esta afirmación obviamente no es incompatible con la posición defendida en este artículo, de que la fábula tiene sentido en sí misma, y sus términos no «corresponden» a otros. Pero no es posible imaginar que un profeta o teólogo del Antiguo Israel, hablando del «evocante» «viña» en un contexto religioso, no tuviera presente el «evocado» «viña de Yavé».

⁽¹⁶⁾ Véase la nota 2.

⁽¹⁷⁾ Véase la nota 4.

⁽¹⁸⁾ La posibilidad de leer vv.22-24 como mesiánicos, es decir, como promesa de restauración de la dinastía davídica con un descendiente de Joaquín, aprovechando la relación entre el cedro de v.3 y el de vv.22-23 es inmediata. Véase W. GRONKOWSKI, *Le Messianisme d'Ézéchiel* (Paris 1930) 35; A. CAQUOT, «Le Messianisme d'Ézéchiel», *Sem* 14 (1964) 15-23, esp. p. 15-18; y últimamente, el sugestivo estudio, con un acercamiento prevalentemente literario, de J. NÚÑEZ REGODÓN, *Imágenes mesiánicas en los profetas* (Ad inst. manuscr.; Roma 1983) 40-54.

responsabilidad de la viña de volverse hacia las aguas de vida, o apartarse de ellas, ¿qué función desempeña la cima del cedro, que también ha sido puesta en tierra (vv.3-4), y de la cual no se vuelve a hablar en vv.5-10?

Sin poder ofrecer una solución completamente satisfactoria, se puede sin embargo sugerir una orientación para la ulterior reflexión.

El Sal 80,9-12 tiene numerosos puntos de contacto con Ez 17,1-10. El salmista recuerda a Yavé sus hechos salvíficos hacia su pueblo para moverlo a misericordia. El hecho central es que Yavé ha arrancado una viña del Egipto para plantarla, después de haber expulsado otros pueblos. La viña-Israel ha echado raíces y ha llenado el país. Pero la cosa extraordinaria es que «su sombra ha cubierto las montañas, y sus ramas los cedros majestuosos» (v.11). En el contexto de la expansión de Israel hasta el Mar y hasta el Río (v.12) es verosímil que los cedros aludan oscuramente a otras naciones poderosas, sobre las cuales se ha extendido el poder de Israel. De modo semejante es verosímil que también en Ez 17,1-10 resuene la contraposición entre el cedro, una nación noble y grande *puesta* por Yavé en la tierra de Canaán, pero no plantada, y la viña, plantada en la misma tierra y destinada a cubrir los cedros. Si tal pensamiento está presente en Ez 17,1-10, la pregunta en la cual se concentra el sentido del texto «¿tendrá éxito?», que equivale a «¿será fiel?», se vuelve tanto más acuciante. ¿Abandonará la viña las aguas vivificantes, ella que ha sido antepuesta a cedros majestuosos?

Es difícil otorgar a esta hipótesis más que un cierto grado de probabilidad. Pero la certeza (relativa) alcanzada para la interpretación propuesta de los vv.5-10 permite aceptarla⁽¹⁹⁾.

(19) Otra posibilidad sería considerar la cima del cedro y el gajo de la vid como dos imágenes complementarias referidas a la misma realidad. De manera similar en Ez 19 Israel (más verosímelmente que la «reina madre») es leona en medio de leones (vv.1-9) y cepo de vid plantado junto a aguas abundantes (vv.10-14). Cfr. NUÑEZ REGODÓN, *Imágenes*, 45-46. Sin embargo, es verdad que en Ez 19 se trata claramente de dos unidades textuales complementarias pero completa cada una en sí misma. El caso de Ez 17,1-10 es diferente.

5. *ḥîdâ* y *māšāl*

En el decurso de este estudio hemos utilizado el término fábula para Ez 17,1-10 a fin de no prejuzgar sobre su carácter, y para contraponerlo a las interpretaciones.

Pero el texto se define a sí mismo como *ḥîdâ* y *māšāl* (v.2). ¿Cómo deben ser comprendidos estos términos en este texto?

El uso abundante de *ḥîdâ* en Jue 14 (ocho veces el sustantivo y tres el verbo) ha influido probablemente para considerar el significado «adivinanza» allí presente como al analogado principal de su significación⁽²⁰⁾. La *ḥîdâ* de Sansón no es sino un caprichoso pasatiempo, un juego de salón, en el cual los participantes deben adivinar el sentido dado por el animador a los términos — el «código» arbitrariamente establecido — inspirándose en un incidente casual (el león que debe matar, y las abejas que construyen su panal sobre el cadáver).

Pero *ḥîdâ* puede tener otro sentido, el que aparece también en Sal 78 y probablemente en Sal 49. Estos dos textos y Ez 17,1-10 — y solamente ellos — caracterizan una composición como *ḥîdâ* y *māšāl* simultáneamente (cf. Sal 78,2; 49,5).

El largo salmo histórico-didáctico 78 está precedido por una introducción (vv.1-8) y dividido en dos grandes secciones de aproximadamente la misma longitud por una reflexión intermedia, vv.32-39⁽²¹⁾.

El carácter de *ḥîdâ* del salmo está justificado por esta reflexión, que explicita en términos generales lo que el resto del salmo narra como acontecimientos históricos particulares: mientras más beneficios recibían los israelitas de Yavé, tanto más crecían sus pecados;

⁽²⁰⁾ H.-P. MÜLLER, «Der Begriff 'Rätsel' im Alten Testament», *VT* 20 (1970) 465-489, considera la correspondencia entre el lenguaje «en código» y la realidad como constitutivos del «enigma». Los objetos de Ez 17,1-10 estarían en código (p. 474). El texto es tratado como alegoría. Müller no parece establecer claros límites entre alegoría y parábola. — V. HAMP, «ḥîdāh», *THAT* II, 873, suponiendo una estrecha correspondencia entre la fábula y la interpretación también considera *ḥîdâ* en Ez 17 como parábola más que como adivinanza. Bajo «parábola» sin embargo parece comprender «alegoría».

⁽²¹⁾ J. MUÑOZ, «Estudio sobre el salmo 78», *Cuadernos Bíblicos* n° 4 (Valencia 1980) 74-101, ha mostrado adecuadamente la organización del salmo.

mientras más riguroso era el castigo, más dispuestos estaban a volver a Yavé. Y así, no obstante sus mentiras e infidelidad, Yavé perdonaba una vez más.

El enigma (como se debería traducir *ḥîdâ* en estos tres textos) de la historia de Israel no consiste en los hechos concretos de salvación y pecado, castigo y conversión, infidelidad y longanimidad, comprensibles en sí mismos como hechos históricos (salida de Egipto, diferentes castigos, diferentes beneficios) sino en la misteriosa interacción existente entre ellos. Lo lógico e inteligible sería que al beneficio corresponda la gratitud, al pecado siga la ruptura, al castigo responda la rebelión. Pero la misteriosa interrelación entre Yavé y su pueblo está más allá de toda comprensión.

Tampoco la *ḥîdâ* de Sal 49 es una adivinanza. El enigma no consiste en que personas ricas pongan su confianza en las riquezas; ni en que un hombre rico termine sus días en el Sheol, adonde no pueden acompañarlo sus riquezas, sino en la conducta inexplicable de quien sabe que esto es así, y no obstante centra su vida en los fugaces honores. Tal vez v.13 es quien resume el pensamiento más concisamente: «Quien se encuentra en los honores no es capaz de comprender».

Semejantemente, la *ḥîdâ* de Ez 17,1-10 no es una adivinanza, donde el lector o el auditor es desafiado a identificar los valores que el autor ha dado a cada uno de los términos: águila, cedro, viña, etc. Lo verdaderamente enigmático es la relación entre los diferentes actores de la fábula. El enigma alcanza su expresión plena en las preguntas de vv.1-10. «¿Es que...?». La pregunta queda abierta. El autor de la fábula no se preocupa de dar una respuesta, porque sabe que no existe una respuesta. Su misión es fijar en la mente de los auditores la pregunta. Cada uno sabe que es su propia responsabilidad dar una u otra respuesta, quedar junto a las aguas, o volverse hacia el viento del desierto.

La tensión inherente a la narración y la urgencia producida en el lector de buscar una explicación de la *ḥîdâ*/enigma que vaya más allá de la trama elemental presente, y consiguientemente la posibilidad de nuevas reinterpretaciones, establecen la estrecha relación entre el carácter de enigma y de *māšāl*, comprendido como parábola y no como alegoría, de Ez 17,1-10⁽²²⁾.

(22) Véase las notas 4 y 7.

Ez 17,1-10 aparece así como enigma y parábola al mismo tiempo. Enigmático no es el sentido del texto, que pensamos haber comprendido, sino el posible comportamiento de la viña frente al agua. No hay argumentos para prever si la viña será fiel o no. El texto no supone una respuesta. Se deja abierta la respuesta, que es la del lector.

Como parábola, Ez 17,1-10 está abierto a nuevas interpretaciones, pero apunta claramente en una dirección. El texto nos hace comprender, que la única respuesta sensata de la viña debería ser quedar junto a las aguas. La exhortación «Ve tú, y haz otro tanto» (Lc 10,37), queda sobreentendida.

Pontificio Instituto Bíblico
Via della Pilotta, 25
00187 Roma

Horacio SIMIAN-YOFRE

SUMMARY

Ez 17,1-10 is usually considered by exegetes to be an allegory, whose meaning is to be understood from vv.12ff. After indicating the difficulties of such interpretation, this paper attempts to show that Ez 17,1-10 is truly a parable, similar to those found in the NT; that as such it presents a meaning in itself, but always open to new interpretations; and that the interpretations proposed by Ez 17,11-12 and 17,22-24 are only two applications to concrete situations which do not exhaust the meaning of the parable.

Words of Grace (Luke 4,22)

This study sets out to offer a suggestion concerning the meaning and function of τοῖς λόγοις τῆς χάριτος in Luke 4,22, which has not been considered in the modern discussion, and to clarify and to test the viability of the proposed sense for χάρις by a study of other related uses of the word.

Luke's account of the rejection of Jesus at Nazareth in 4,16-30 has received repeated attention in the scholarly literature⁽¹⁾. One of the central problems in the passage is posed by the contrast between

(1) Beside the commentaries and broader studies recent contributions include E. M. PREVALLET, "The Rejection at Nazareth Lk 4: 14-30", *Scripture* 20 (1968) 5-9; J. BAJARD, "La structure de la péricope de Nazareth en Luc 4: 16-30. Propositions pour une lecture plus cohérente", *ETL* 45 (1969) 165-171; L. C. CROCKETT, "Luke 4: 25-7 and Jewish-Gentile Relations in Luke-Acts", *JBL* 88 (1969) 177-183; H. SCHÜRMANN, "Zur Traditionsgeschichte der Nazarethperikope Lk 4, 16-30", in A. DESCAMPS and A. DE HALLEUX [eds.], *Mélanges Bibliques en hommage au R. P. Bédé Rigaux* (Gembloux 1970) 187-206; D. HILL, "The Rejection at Nazareth", *NT* 13 (1971) 161-180; W. ELTESTER, "Israel im lukanischen Werk und die Nazarethperikope", in *Jesus in Nazareth* (BZNW 40; Berlin 1972) 76-147; A. STROBEL, "Die Ausrufung des Jubeljahres in der Nazarethpredigt Jesu; zur apokalyptischen Tradition Lc 4,16-30", *ibid.*, 38-50; R. C. TANNEHILL, "The Mission of Jesus according to Luke iv 16-30", *ibid.*, 51-75; H. J. B. COMBRINK, "The Structure and Significance of Luke 4: 16-30", *Neotest* 7 (1973) 27-47; B. REICKE, "Jesus in Nazareth — Lk 4,14-30", in H. BALZ and S. SCHULZ [eds.], *Das Wort und die Wörter. FS G. Friedrich* (Stuttgart 1973) 47-56; E. SAMAIN, "Aucun prophète n'est bien reçu dans sa patrie. Lc 4,21-30", *AssSeign* 35 (1973) 63-72; J. A. SANDERS, "From Isaiah 61 to Luke 4", in J. NEUSNER (ed.), *Christianity, Judaism and other Greco-Roman Cults: Studies for M. Smith at Sixty* (StJudLatAnt 12/1; Leiden 1975) 75-106; B. RINALDI, "Proclamare ai prigionieri la liberazione (Lc. 4,18)", *BibOr* 18 (1976) 241-245; G. M. LEE, "Further on Pantós, 'Perhaps'?", *NT* 19 (1977) 240; J. NOLLAND, "Classical and Rabbinic Parallels to 'Physician, Heal Yourself' (Lk. IV.23)", *NT* 21 (1979) 193-209; *id.*, "Impressed Unbelievers as Witnesses to Christ (Luke 2.22 a)", *JBL* 98 (1979) 219-229.

verse 22 and verses 28-29: In verse 22 Luke apparently indicates a positive first response in the synagogue to Jesus' words ("all bore witness to him and were amazed at the words of grace which proceeded out of his mouth"); in verses 28-29, at the end of the episode there is total hostility to Jesus ("all in the synagogue were filled with wrath"). The need to explain this transition has loomed large in the study of the pericope⁽²⁾ and has been the determining factor in most of the attempts to understand Luke's phrase τοῖς λόγοις τῆς χάριτος. Three classical positions have emerged.

C. Masson, in a study published in 1961, suggests that almost all commentators understand the genitive τῆς χάριτος as a genitive of quality and thus emphasise the attractiveness of the form of the words⁽³⁾. This view finds a measure of support in the Rabbinic references cited by H. Strack and P. Billerbeck which show concern for proper form and attractiveness of presentation in the synagogue address⁽⁴⁾. However, the climate of academic opinion has since shifted and the understanding of χάρις here as "winsomeness" has come to look more and more like an old-fashioned exercise in harmonization. Certainly it must be admitted that Luke nowhere else uses χάρις to designate "winsomeness"⁽⁵⁾, and in this phrase, so

⁽²⁾ Some have given up the attempt and have affirmed a lack of inner coherence in the account, e.g. A. LOISY, *L'Évangile selon Luc* (Paris 1924) 159-160; R. ASTING, *Die Verkündigung des Wortes im Urchristentum* (Stuttgart 1939) 595-596; A. R. C. LEANEY, *A Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Luke* (Black's New Testament Commentaries; London 1966) 52; P. STUHLMACHER, *Das paulinische Evangelium I. Vorgeschichte* (Göttingen 1968) 226 and note 4; K. LÖNING, "Lukas—Theologe der von Gott geführten Heilsgeschichte", in J. SCHREINER [ed.], *Gestalt und Anspruch des Neuen Testaments* (Wurzburg 1969) 219; G. LOHFINK, *Die Sammlung Israels. Eine Untersuchung zur lukanischen Ekklesiologie* (StANT 39; München 1975) 44-46; and, by implication CROCKETT, "Jewish-Gentile Relations", 177-183; and PREVALLET, "Rejection", 5-9.

⁽³⁾ «Jésus à Nazareth», in *Vers les sources d'eau vive* (Lausanne 1961) 51.

⁽⁴⁾ STRACK-BILLERBECK, IV i, 171-173.

⁽⁵⁾ In Acts 7,10 χάρις in Joseph is perceptible to Pharaoh — this is better than taking χάρις as "favour", which does not couple well with σοφία — but the ἔδωκεν points to something more like the anointing of the θεῖος ἀνὴρ than mere "winsomeness" would give.

reminiscent of phrases using χάρις in Acts⁽⁶⁾, it would be surprising to find a uniquely distinctive usage.

Several scholars⁽⁷⁾, while they feel compelled by Luke's other uses of χάρις to admit that Luke could hardly write τοῖς λόγοις τῆς χάριτος without thinking of the grace of God, nevertheless insist that the logic of the story demands from the synagogue congregation something less committed. The dilemma is resolved by positing a deliberate ambiguity: while Luke sees Jesus' words as words of God's grace, it is possible for the unbelieving audience to hear merely winsome words, and Luke chooses his words to allow for these two vantage points. In favour of such an ambiguity it is possible to point out that the Acts passages available for comparison have a further defining genitive following τῆς χάριτος which ties down unambiguously the sense of χάρις, and to suggest that if Luke had not meant such an ambiguity in Luke 4,22 he would have quite naturally added a further defining genitive.

This suggestion has all the attractions of a mediating position. Nevertheless, it continues to be vulnerable to major objections to the understanding of χάρις as "winsomeness". Only if it is possible to make a sharp distinction between what Jesus is asserting and the charm and attractiveness of his words, does χάρις as "winsomeness" resolve for us the tension between an initial positive response to Jesus (charmed by his words) and a later emphatic rejection (indignant at his claims)⁽⁸⁾. Now, in our text the words of grace are summarized as "Today this scripture has been fulfilled in your hearing" (verse 21). So, these words which are τῆς χάριτος may be expected to have as part of their essential content an affirmation that the day of fulfilment of God's gracious purpose has arrived precisely because the people find themselves addressed by the messianic prophet. In which case, surely it is incredible that Jesus' momentous claims can

⁽⁶⁾ Cf. Acts 14,3 τῷ λογῷ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ; 20,24 τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς χάριτος τοῦ θεοῦ; 20,32 τῷ λογῷ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ.

⁽⁷⁾ E.g. H. CONZELMANN, χάρις κτλ., *TDNT*, vol. IX, 392 note 153; H. FLENDER, *St. Luke: Theologian of Redemptive History* (ET; London 1967) 153. Cf. E. KLOSTERMANN, *Das Lukasevangelium* (HNT 5; Tübingen 1929) 63.

⁽⁸⁾ Cf. A. PLUMMER, *Gospel according to St. Luke* (ICC; Edinburgh 1901) 124: "They bore witness to Him, not that what He said about Himself, but that what rumour had said respecting His power as a teacher was true".

be left to one side while comment is made on his powers of oratory⁽⁹⁾. One must agree with Loisy: “On aurait été frappé de sa prétention plus que du charme de sa parole”⁽¹⁰⁾.

There can be no doubt that, were it not for the puzzle presented by the subsequent hostile rejection of Jesus, there would be ready agreement that χάρις is to be referred to the grace of God alone. Indeed, despite this puzzle, the difficulties inherent in other views have produced a growing consensus that one should start from an understanding of χάρις as “God’s grace”.

If we regard this growing consensus as the necessary point of departure for further investigation then there are three areas which require further elucidation.

1. The problem remains of relating astonishment at “words of God’s grace” to the hostile rejection of verses 28-29.

2. It is not sufficient to define “words of God’s grace” merely negatively as the alternative to “winsome words”. What particular understanding of “grace” is involved? And in what way are the words “words of grace”?

3. Closely related, or indeed another aspect of the same concern, is the question: From whose perspective are Jesus’ words “words of grace”? The view that there is a deliberate ambiguity in the phrase “words of grace”, should alert us to the fact that there are two possible perspectives from which Jesus’ words can be identified as words of grace. Is it the synagogue congregation that regards Jesus’ words as words of grace or does Luke use his narrator’s privileged position to tell his readers that Jesus’ words are words of grace, whatever the participants assessment might have been?

It is not possible here to develop in detail an approach to the first of these areas of concern⁽¹¹⁾. However several points may be briefly made.

⁽⁹⁾ Consider the artificiality of an encounter exhibiting the following pattern:

Statement: Right here at this moment the eschatological prophecies of Isaiah are coming true in your presence.

Response: You speak beautifully.

⁽¹⁰⁾ A. LOISY, *Les Évangiles synoptiques*, I (Montier-en-Der 1907) 844.

⁽¹¹⁾ This I have done in detail in *Luke’s Readers – a Study of Luke 4.22-8; Acts 13.46; 18.6; 28.28 and Luke 21.5-36* (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation; University of Cambridge 1977), chapter I.

a. On other occasions as well Luke has people impressed by Christianity in some way but proceeding to reject it (Acts 4,13; 6,10.11; 25,24).

b. Indeed, as I have argued elsewhere⁽¹²⁾, Luke offers impressed unbelievers as a special category of witnesses to Christ — all the better witnesses for their subsequent behaviour which shows that they have no vested interest in the Christian movement.

c. Along the same line, it is probably Luke who sees the people's reaction as a testimony to Christ. The content of their testimony is their astonishment⁽¹³⁾.

d. Further, as intimated above and as will be argued below, the people are not astonished because they perceive "words of grace". The mention of the presence of χάρις is Luke's explanation to the reader: it is not Luke's formulation of the awareness of Jesus' audience.

I suggest that these points constitute the basis of a credible understanding of the transition from astonishment to hostile rejection. With the exception of point d, these observations will provide in some measure a framework within which the subsequent discussion will proceed.

The concern of this essay is to establish that χάρις as a Lukan perspective is defensible contextually within the pericope, and that the meaning of χάρις required for such a judgment is one which we should reasonably expect of Luke on the basis of a wider study of the use of the word in Luke's writings and beyond.

I am proposing, then, that we should not understand Luke to be saying that the people marvel at Jesus' words because they are conscious of them as words τῆς χάριτος⁽¹⁴⁾. Rather, Luke is saying that it is precisely because Jesus' words are τῆς χάριτος that they have their impact. The people admit to the impact of the words on them; Luke wants his readers to see that it is the τῆς χάριτος which makes it possible for the words to have their impact.

If this is so, it suggests a rather dynamic sense for χάρις, where it is the presence of χάρις which gives the words their quite tangible

⁽¹²⁾ "Impressed Unbelievers", esp. 225-228.

⁽¹³⁾ For a discussion of the Greek syntax see *ibid.*, 228-229.

⁽¹⁴⁾ Cf. LOISY (*Luc*, 158): «Le discours serait caractérisé d'après son objet, non d'après l'idée que s'en fait la foule».

impact. Χάρις is some kind of divine influence present in the words⁽¹⁵⁾.

From the outset it must be said that the major reason for regarding τοῖς λόγοις τῆς χάριτος as a Lukan perspective is the same as that which earlier generated the understanding of this phrase as “winsome words”: it facilitates the transition from verse 22 to verses 28-29.

Are there any difficulties, thrown up by the immediate context, to thus construing τοῖς λόγοις τῆς χάριτος?

The words could not represent a Lukan perspective if the adjacent phrase “proceeding out of his mouth” is to be related to the question “Is not this the son of Joseph?” which follows. In this case, the impact on the people is not just a response to the words, but is, rather, an astonishment that such a message should be delivered by such a person: “Staunen ob solcher Gnadenbotschaft aus dem Munde eines der Ihrigen”⁽¹⁶⁾. On this understanding, “Is not this the son of Joseph?” becomes an expression of amazement. And if this is so, it would not be possible to relate the people’s astonishment quite so directly to “the words of grace”.

The problem with this suggestion is the need to place a stress on αὐτοῦ: the words come out of his mouth, rather than out of the mouth of somebody more suitable. The position of the word hardly encourages such a stress and the earlier αὐτῷ after ἐμαρτύρουν would seem to preclude a stress on αὐτοῦ. Further, the ἐμαρτύρουν αὐτῷ in itself suggests that the people were impressed by his speech rather than surprised that such a one should be its mouthpiece⁽¹⁷⁾.

⁽¹⁵⁾ Along quite different lines from that pursued here, several scholars have introduced a certain dynamism into their understanding of χάρις here. E. SAMAIN, “Le discours-programme de Nazareth. Lc 4,16-21”, *AssSeign* 20 (1973) 27, following J. DUPONT, *Le discours de Milet. Testament spirituel de Saint Paul (Actes 20,18-36)* (Lectio divina 32; Paris 1962) 104-105, does so by paralleling “words of grace” and the gospel and considering the gospel as a message which brings God’s grace. I. DE LA POTTERIE, «L’onction du Christ. Étude de théologie biblique», *NRT* 80 (1958) 231, and M. CAMBE, “La ΧΑΡΙΣ chez Saint Luc”, *RB* 70 (1963) 200-201, following F. GILS, *Jésus Prophète d’après les évangiles synoptiques* (*OrBiLov* 2; Louvain 1957) 19, in identifying “words of grace” with the inspired speech of a prophet.

⁽¹⁶⁾ H. SCHÜRMANN, *Das Lukasevangelium. Erster Teil: Kommentar zu Kap. 1,1-9,50* (HThK 3/1; Freiburg 1969) 235.

⁽¹⁷⁾ Assuming ἐμαρτύρουν to have a positive rather than a negative con-

Luke could have better expressed the latter sentiment with “they marvelled that out of his mouth were coming the (or such) words of grace”: ὅτι (cf. 11,38) ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ ἐξεπορεύοντο οἱ λόγοι τῆς χάριτος.

If “proceeding out of his mouth” does not link to what follows, it may have a link to something earlier in the pericope. It would be attractive to relate “proceeding out of his mouth” to the fulfilment concept expressed in the previous verse where the Isaiah quotation is spoken of as “fulfilled in your ears”, that is, it is fulfilled by being spoken by the one (Jesus) for whom to speak the words was prophetically destined. If this is the right connection, “proceeding out of his mouth” would stress the fulfilment of the Isaianic words in the fact of their being taken on the lips of Jesus: “fulfilled in your ears” by “coming out of his mouth”.

The suggestion does encounter some difficulties. A reaction to Jesus’ reading is already recorded in verse 20: “The eyes of all in the synagogue were gazing intently at him”, which makes it less natural for the reaction in verse 22 to be to the same words. A lot depends on what force we should give to ἤρξατο⁽¹⁸⁾. If it makes a sharp separation between the reading and the comment, then the

notation. J. JEREMIAS, *Jesus’ Promise to the Nations* (StBibT 24; London 1958) 44-46, developing a suggestion made by B. VIOLET, “Zum rechten Verständnis der Nazareth-Perikope”, *ZNW* 37 (1938) 251-271, understands ἐμαρτύρουν αὐτῷ as “they bore witness against him”. Although followed by W. GRUNDMANN, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (THKNT 3; Berlin 1961) 121 and K. H. RENGSTORF, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (NTD 3; Göttingen 1958) 68, this view has been effectively overturned by H. ANDERSON, “Broadening Horizons. The Rejection at Nazareth Pericope of Lk 4:16-30 in the Light of Recent Critical Trends”, *Interpr* 18 (1964) 267-269 and HILL, “Rejection”, 163-165. ELTESTER, “Israel”, esp. 111 and 138, has argued that ἐμαρτύρουν suggests that the people witnessed (= experienced) this self-manifestation of Jesus, with the implication that they are, therefore, responsible for their consequent rejection of Jesus. In “Impressed Unbelievers”, 222-225 I have shown that Eltester’s case is based on a misunderstanding of the text in *Praedicatio Petri* to which he makes appeal, and that, in the absence of any further lexical support, his understanding of the text cannot be sustained.

⁽¹⁸⁾ For a brief discussion of the alternatives see I. H. MARSHALL, *The Gospel of Luke* (The New International Greek Testament Commentary; Exeter 1978) 184-185. The relative frequency of Luke’s use of ἀρχομαι suggests that some semitizing uses are to be expected.

present participle ἐκπορευομένοις could hardly relate back past Jesus' words in verse 21 to the Isaianic words which are earlier and separate. On the other hand, if we regard ἤρξατο as a Semitism, then, there need be no such sharp separation, and one can point to the imperfections in verse 22: ἐμαρτύρουν and ἐθαύμαζον, and suggest that the rapt attention of verse 20 is already the beginning of the astonishment. In this case, "words of grace" would refer to the communication of Jesus consisting of the reading and the explanation.

The connection "fulfilled in your ears" by "proceeding out of his mouth" remains attractive, if uncertain. By itself, one way or another, the verdict here is not decisive for our inquiry about who considers Jesus' words to be "words of grace". If the connection were to be established, it would indicate an important link between the "words of grace" and the reading of verses 18-19. The literary nature of the proposed connection here may tip the scales in favour of a Lukan perspective being involved.

Similar phrases to τοῖς ἐκπορευομένοις ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ occur a number of times in the Septuagint⁽¹⁹⁾. Such phrases can be little more than synonyms for "which he spoke" or something similar⁽²⁰⁾. Nevertheless, the LXX usages suggest that there is a certain dignity, solemnity or sense of occasion added by the presence of this idiom⁽²¹⁾. H. Schürmann thinks that Deut 8,3b, ἐπὶ παντὶ ῥήματι τῷ ἐκπορευομένῳ διὰ στόματος θεοῦ ζήσεται ὁ ἄνθρωπος, is alluded to by Luke, indicating that the words are God's words and life-giving⁽²²⁾. However, it could equally be that Prov 3,16, ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτῆς ἐκπορεύεται δικαιοσύνη, . . . ἔλεον ἐπὶ γλώσσης φορεῖ is in mind and that Jesus is here identified with wisdom. It is even possible that Luke had in mind the description of the king in Ps 44(45),3, ἐξεχύθη χάρις ἐν χεῖλεσίν σου. It is best not to think of a particular passage but rather more generally of a use of "biblical

⁽¹⁹⁾ The main verbs employed are ἐξέρχομαι and ἐκπορεύομαι. Others include ἐκχέω, ἀκούομαι, οὐκ ἐπιλανθάνομαι, οὐκ ἀφίστημι. Both στόμα and χεῖλη are used.

⁽²⁰⁾ E.g. 1 Kgs 2,3; Jdt 5,5; Jer 17,16.

⁽²¹⁾ Often in connection with the commitment implied in an oath. E.g. Isa 55,11; Ps 88(89),34; Deut 23,23(24); 1 Sam 1,23; Ps 44(45),3. Cf. also Job 41,10(11).12(13).

⁽²²⁾ *Das Lukasevangelium*, 234 and note 93.

language" to enhance the reader's sense of the significance of what is transpiring.

Once again the observations are not decisive for our inquiry. However, as we are dealing here with the reader's sense of the significance of what is transpiring, this may encourage us to believe that the same is likely for the preceding phrase⁽²³⁾.

J. Jeremias has offered a distinctive understanding of the phrase τοῖς λόγοις τῆς χάριτος which depends upon the words expressing the perception of the synagogue congregation⁽²⁴⁾. He argues that there is in fact no change in the attitude of the hearers throughout the course of the incident. From the outset unanimous rage was their response to the message of Jesus. Jeremias achieves this reconstruction by understanding ἐμαρτύρουν αὐτῷ as "they bore witness against him". Further ἐθαύμαζον is said to register opposition to what is strange. Jeremias then suggests that the strange thing opposed is a message that stresses the mercy of God (τοῖς λόγοις τῆς χάριτος), and has no mention of eschatological vengeance on the Gentiles. (The quotation in verses 18-19 from Isa 61,1-2 ends with "the year of the Lord's favour". Isa 61,2 continues: "and the day of vengeance of our God [on the Gentiles]").

Jeremias' reconstruction is attractive and has been followed by K. H. Rengstorff and W. Grundmann⁽²⁵⁾. However, serious objections have come to light in the studies of H. Anderson and D. Hill⁽²⁶⁾. In the context of our study of χάρις it is particularly problematical for Jeremias' view that χάρις elsewhere in Luke/Acts is always a very dynamic concept⁽²⁷⁾, and therefore it seems unlikely that Luke would use it here to refer to God's mercy-as-a-subject-matter. If he were to have used χάρις in this way we should at least have expected τοῖς λόγοις περὶ (τῆς) χάριτος, "words concerning grace"⁽²⁸⁾.

⁽²³⁾ This judgment is reinforced if ἐμαρτύρουν is, as I have argued in "Impressed Unbelievers", Luke's way of drawing his reader's attention to the evidential value of the astonished reaction to Jesus' words.

⁽²⁴⁾ *Jesus' Promise*, 44-46.

⁽²⁵⁾ RENGSTORF, *Lukas*, 68; GRUNDMANN, *Lukas*, 121.

⁽²⁶⁾ ANDERSON, "Rejection", 267-269; HILL, "Rejection", 163-165.

⁽²⁷⁾ See below.

⁽²⁸⁾ Cf. Luke 1,1 διήγησιν περὶ τῶν πεπληροφορημένων ἐν ἡμῖν πραγμάτων; 24,19 τὰ περὶ Ἰησοῦ; also Luke 5,15 and Acts 19,40.

Not quite so pointedly, but nevertheless to effect, the same criticism may be levelled at the view that the people were amazed that they heard words saying that God's gracious offer of salvation was now being extended to them. As will become clear in the study below of Luke's other uses of χάρις, Luke is not likely to speak of χάρις being offered, without meaning also that χάρις is brought to bear in the situation. Now, if the people recognize not only that they are being spoken to about an offer of God's grace, but also that they are encountering God's grace in this offer, then A. R. C. Leaney is right that Luke "has given us an impossible story"⁽²⁹⁾: there can be no adequate account of the transition from the situation of verse 22 where the people recognize that they are being encountered by the grace of God, and the situation in verses 28-29 where they are filled with a murderous rage towards Jesus.

From our review, then, of the contextual considerations, it would appear that there are no particular obstacles in the text of the pericope to understanding τοῖς λόγοις τῆς χάριτος as expressing a Lukan perspective. Indeed there may be some encouragement in this direction.

We have, therefore, the possibility that Luke is saying that Jesus' words have their impact because they are τῆς χάριτος. The people are not amazed *that* the words are τῆς χάριτος, but they are amazed *because* the words are τῆς χάριτος (even if they don't know it)⁽³⁰⁾. Though they will not open themselves to it, the word which is the vehicle of God's grace touches them. The presence of χάρις gives the words their quite tangible impact⁽³¹⁾. Χάρις is manifest as some kind of divine influence present in the words. It remains to be shown that such an understanding of χάρις is one that would

⁽²⁹⁾ Luke, 52.

⁽³⁰⁾ Cf. Acts 6,10 where those from the Hellenistic synagogues with whom Stephen disputed could not withstand τῇ σοφίᾳ καὶ τῷ πνεύματι with which he spoke. We are not to understand that Stephen's opponents conceded that his speech embodied true wisdom and was empowered by the Spirit of God. Their experience was that he was getting the better of them in debate. It is Luke who regards this as a work of the Spirit and a manifestation of divine wisdom.

⁽³¹⁾ While Luke does not maintain the pattern consistently through the gospel, each use of θαυμάζω up to and including that in 4,22 seems to signal to the reader that the experience of the participant is some kind of reflex action to the activity of God present in their midst (1,21.63; 2,18.33).

come naturally to Luke and to see whether further study of the word can clarify the notion of χάρις which, it has been suggested, is involved here in Luke 4,22.

A field of meaning for the word in which χάρις is viewed as a kind of power or influence which can be present in someone, sometimes in a quasi-physical sense, has been clearly recognized⁽³²⁾ and may be traced from the classical period through the New Testament era and beyond into the Corpus Hermeticum⁽³³⁾ and the philosophical traditions represented by Porphyry and Philostratus⁽³⁴⁾.

There is no doubt that some of the New Testament uses of χάρις are to be correlated with this field. Frequently in Paul χάρις is associated with a power that comes from God to be in the believer. Sometimes the χάρις seems to be directly equated with the power, sometimes the stress is more on the experience of God which produces in the believer this power⁽³⁵⁾. In Heb 13,9 grace is suggested as an alternative to food as a source of strength, while in 4,16 χάρις is a power given by God for timely help. In each case there is an ability or power from God which is internally possessed.

There have not been lacking those who have seen the relevance of this dynamic sense of χάρις for illuminating some of the Lukan

(32) CONZELMANN, χάρις, 376, following WETTER, *Charis*, 40-46, maintains as a Hellenistic development a qualitative change from "power/influence" in a more general sense to "power" in a more distinctly substantial sense. However, χάρις is, at least metaphorically, treated as a substance in Hom. *Od.* 6, 235-236 and Soph. *OC* 1751-1752, and it is doubtful whether the change is as qualitatively decisive as Conzelmann maintains (cf. J. MOFFATT, *Grace in the New Testament* [London 1931] 21-29).

(33) E.g. Corp. Herm. I,32, αἰτουμένῳ τὸ μὴ σφαλῆναι τῆς γνώσεως τῆς κατ' οὐσίαν ἡμῶν ἐπίνευσόν μοι· καὶ ἐνδυνάμωσόν με καὶ [πληρωσόν με] τῆς χάριτος ταύτης [ἵνα] φωτίσω τοὺς ἐν ἀγνοίᾳ τοῦ γένους... καθὼς παρέδωκας αὐτῷ τὴν πᾶσαν ἐξουσίαν.

The text is quoted as given by WETTER, *Charis*, 126. W. SCOTT, *Hermetica* (Oxford 1924) supplies a different conjectural restoration of the text which seems less likely than the above and which can in any case allow the same sense for χάρις. CONZELMANN, χάρις, 376, lists other references.

(34) These belong to the θεῖος ἀνὴρ circle of ideas and we may refer the reader to L. BIELER, *ΘΕΙΟΣ ΑΝΗΡ* (Wien 1935) 50-56.

(35) E.g. 1 Cor 15,10; 2 Cor 9,14; 12,9. For a useful short statement of Paul's use of χάρις, see J. G. D. DUNN, *Jesus and the Spirit* (London 1975) 202-205.

uses of the word⁽³⁶⁾. Thus, for example, when Acts 6,8 speaks of Stephen as πλήρης χάριτος καὶ δυνάμεως there is about as much distinction between χάρις and δύναμις as between the τέρατα and σημεῖα of the following phrase. See also Acts 4,33; 6,8; 7,10; Luke 2,40.

However the relevance of this strand in the meaning of χάρις for understanding τοῖς λόγοις τῆς χάριτος in Lk 4,22 has been disputed by H. Conzelmann⁽³⁷⁾ with the dictum: “χάρις and δύναμις... are distinct in relation to the message, close in relation to the pneumatic”. Χάρις as a quasi-substantial power is well established in the case where the χάρις is resident in or is on a person. Can the same usage be evidenced when it is not a matter of personal charismatic endowment? I believe it can, and that the texts which are scrutinized below support a reading of χάρις in Luke 4,22 in the dynamic, quasi-substantial sense which is elsewhere well established for Luke.

In Euripides *Med.* 439 (βέβακε δ' ὄρκων χάρις, οὐδ' ἔτ' αἰδώς), while χάρις is probably not conceived as substantial power, it is, nevertheless, to be understood as “power” or “effective influence” and (what is important for us) this χάρις is present in the oath. The extreme limit of this tendency in the use of χάρις may be seen in the use of χάρις for love charms (e.g. Luc. *Alex.* 5, χάριτος ἐπὶ τοῖς ἐρωτικοῖς). Power to influence has been fully concretized.

Χάρις is spoken of quasi-substantially in Ps 44(45),2 where we read, ἐξεχύθη [ἡ] χάρις ἐν χεῖλεσίν σου. The χάρις shows itself in what the king says, and the quality of his speech is the correlate to the beauty of his form. It is not indicated whether wisdom, oratory, kindness in speech, etc. is in mind. Χάρις is that about his speech which impresses, which sets him head and shoulders above other men. This is not far from Luke's usage in Luke 4,22.

From the LXX we should note as well Sir 21,16,

Ἐξήγησις μωροῦ ὡς ἐν ὁδοῖ φορτίον,
ἐπὶ δὲ χεῖλους συνετοῦ εὐρεθήσεται χάρις⁽³⁸⁾.

⁽³⁶⁾ E.g. E. HAENCHEN, *The Acts of the Apostles* (ET; Oxford 1971).

⁽³⁷⁾ CONZELMANN, Χάρις, 392 n. 156. Conzelmann is responding here to Wetter's identification of χάρις as a power (*Charis*, 147-149).

⁽³⁸⁾ Χάρις is missing here in A, and in λ' has been altered by a corrector to παραβολή. Παραβολή may have been suggested by the διανοηθήσονται ἐν

On the basis of the parallel between φορτίον and χάρις we may say that “it may be found there” = “one can go there and get it”, not just “one may discover it to be present there”⁽³⁹⁾. In other words χάρις is transferable to the listener. Something like “inspiration” would make a suitable opposite to “burden”, but in any case χάρις is something worthwhile, something helpful⁽⁴⁰⁾.

Just. *Dial.* 9,1. is particularly valuable for comparison since here the χάρις is associated with λόγοις, as in Lk 4,22. Here we read:

Οὐ κενοῖς ἐπιστεύσαμεν μύθοις οὐδὲ ἀναποδείκτοις
λόγοις, ἀλλὰ μεστοῖς πνεύματος θείου καὶ δυνάμει
βρύουσι καὶ τεθηλόσι χάριτι⁽⁴¹⁾.

Justin is certainly waxing lyrical and we cannot ask too much of precision in his meaning. Nonetheless there can be no doubt that he thinks of χάρις, like δύναμις and πνεῦμα θεῖον, being present in the words of the gospel message and giving it its power and authenticity.

Some of Luke's other uses of χάρις may also be adduced in support. As indicated above, χάρις as a quasi-substantial endowment on people is frequent in Luke's writing. However, in several texts Luke also seems to speak of χάρις as a power operating from outside the person involved.

Acts 18,27, where Ἀπολλος συνεβάλετο πολὺ τοῖς πεπιστευκόσιν διὰ τῆς χάριτος, may fall into this category. This is not certain, since there is a strong body of opinion that διὰ τῆς χάριτος refers to

καρδίᾳ of the following verse. However χάρις is to be accepted as the original reading.

⁽³⁹⁾ The form of expression used in Ps 44(45),2 (quoted above) is here taken a step further.

⁽⁴⁰⁾ Something more than “delight” is suggested by verse 17: “They inquire at the mouth of the wise man in the congregation, and they shall ponder his words in their heart”. The various words in Ben Sirac for “wise man” are not to be distinguished.

It is possible that Qoh 10,12 should be added to this list. Λόγοι στόματος σοφοῦ χάρις, καὶ χεὶλη ἄφρονος καταποντιοῦσιν αὐτόν. The bringing together of λόγοι, χάρις and στόμα makes comparison with Luke 4,22 attractive. We can at least say that χάρις as something which gives help would give good balance to the sentence.

⁽⁴¹⁾ Quoted from *BIBLIOΘΗΚΗ ΕΛΛΗΝΩΝ ΠΑΤΕΡΩΝ ΚΑΙ ΕΚΚΛΗΣΙΑΣΤΙΚΩΝ ΣΥΓΓΡΑΦΕΩΝ*, Vol. 3 (Athens 1955).

Apollos and links with συνεβάλετο⁽⁴²⁾. And if this is so then the sense of χάρις will be, as Holtzmann notes, the same as at Acts 6,8.

Πεπιστευκόσιν is, however, the immediate antecedent to χάρις and has the first claim to be considered as the point of attachment for διὰ τῆς χάριτος. J. Moffatt⁽⁴³⁾ argues that, "The omission of διὰ τῆς χάριτος from the ordinary text (ὑπεβάλετο (*sic.*) πολὺ τοῖς πεπιστευκόσιν διὰ τῆς χάριτος) by some authorities under the influence of the Western text, really confirms the view that the words were taken with πεπιστευκόσιν, for they were left out as apparently redundant". The whole episode is notoriously difficult⁽⁴⁴⁾ and no firm decision on the correct connection is possible. But, if the connection is with πεπιστευκόσιν, it is significant that χάρις here stands outside the person and exercises its influence on the person.

In Acts 14,26 and 15,40 there is a certain continuity in the sense of χάρις with that which we have considered for 18,27. In 14,26 we have παραδεδομένοι τῇ χάριτι τοῦ θεοῦ and it is to be understood that this had been done by the Christians at Antioch with regard to Paul and Barnabas. In 15,40 it is παραδοθεὶς τῇ χάριτι τοῦ Κυρίου ὑπὸ τῶν ἀδελφῶν. The phrase is stereotyped. Haenchen⁽⁴⁵⁾ suggests it is "part of the Christian vocabulary of devotion and probably originated in prayer". Luke's interest is in the approval and involvement of the "sending" church in the missionary endeavours, not in the function of grace in the mission. For this reason we cannot rest too much weight on the usage of χάρις here. Nevertheless the phrase is in Luke's own personal vocabulary of devotion and thus could well reflect his theology and we should not fail to note the usage. The two uses we have here are in the context of leave taking, and since the use of παραδίδωμι fits this context so well, this

⁽⁴²⁾ Thus HOLTZMANN, *Apostelgeschichte*, 119; A. LOISY, *Les Actes des Apôtres* (Paris 1920) 716; H. W. BEYER, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (NTD 2/5; Göttingen 1955) 114-115; H. CONZELMANN, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (HNT 7; Tübingen 1963) 109; G. STÄHLIN, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (NTD 5; Göttingen 1966) 249; *et al.*

⁽⁴³⁾ *Grace*, 362.

⁽⁴⁴⁾ Of particular importance in determining the probabilities for the connection of χάρις is one's answer to the question: does ζέων πνεύματι refer to the Holy Spirit? As well his own comments see the literature cited at HAENCHEN, *Acts*, 550 notes 7 and 8.

⁽⁴⁵⁾ *Acts*, 437.

is probably the context that gives rise to the expression. Those leaving have been in the circle of care, protection, help, etc. of the church. They are leaving this and are handed over to the safe-keeping of χάρις. God's grace is a power that is able to take care of those who must leave the church fellowship behind.

With different vocabulary the idea is very similar at Acts 20,32, παρατίθεται ὑμᾶς τῷ Κυρίῳ καὶ τῷ λόγῳ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ. Since those to whom Paul speaks would see his face no more, they must now stand without his help, and he entrusts them to the (unmediated) care and protection of the Lord and the word of his grace⁽⁴⁶⁾. This verse has special interest for us because of the association of χάρις with λόγος. More so when "the word of his grace" is spoken of as "able to build you up..." There is certainly a power involved here and I suggest that here and at Luke 4,22 the τῆς χάριτος (αὐτοῦ) designates the power resident in (or perhaps better, capable of being conveyed by) the word(s)⁽⁴⁷⁾. For Moffatt λόγος already suggests power since he considers that in Acts, "the word (of the Lord or of God) suggests almost a personified power in the life of the community"⁽⁴⁸⁾. Certainly ὁ λόγος can be spoken of as of a living thing⁽⁴⁹⁾. However the notion of a power can only be claimed at 19,20, and this is one of the three references (6,7; 12,24; 19,20) where the sense is given if we replace "the word of God (or the Lord)" with "the church". The usage at 19,20 is thus distinct from that at 20,32. We are thus justified in considering that the reference to power is contained in χάρις and not in λόγος. Moffatt⁽⁵⁰⁾ says of the phrase "God and the word of his grace", "the collocation implies a sort of 'mystical independence' of the word, which is so charged with a divine or numinous power that the writer can speak of it side by side with God Himself". He expresses the situation well with the correction that it is really the χάρις that stands along-

⁽⁴⁶⁾ Cf. Acts 14,23; Luke 23,46 for this use of παρατίθημι by Luke.

⁽⁴⁷⁾ Cf. M. CAMBE, 201: «La vertu salvifique est inséparablement reconnue à Dieu et à la parole de la grâce; τῷ λόγῳ τῆς χάριτος est même, semble-t-il, l'antécédent de τῷ δυνάμει (Act. XX, 32)». The context makes clear that Cambe finds in χάρις the reference to power.

⁽⁴⁸⁾ *Grace*, 363.

⁽⁴⁹⁾ See especially its use with αὐξάνω at Acts 6,7; 12,24; 19,20.

⁽⁵⁰⁾ *Grace*, 363.

side God and ὁ λόγος only in so far as the χάρις is conveyed or carried by ὁ λόγος. Ἡ χάρις is “the divine or numinous power”. At Acts 14,3 (τῷ Κυρίῳ τῷ μαρτυροῦντι τῷ λόγῳ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ) the sense of χάρις is not closely determined by the context, but there would be a certain appropriateness if the word imbued with power is given supporting testimony by deeds of power: “granting signs and wonders to be done by their hands”⁽⁵¹⁾. Of course it is possible that “the word of his grace” is here merely the message that offers salvation as now available through the name of Jesus. The expression is elliptical but whichever way we understand it, it seems clear to me that χάρις is receivable and not just stated to be God’s attitude, nor yet a past salvific act of God. If τῷ λόγῳ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ is a message about God’s grace it must at the same time offer God’s grace⁽⁵²⁾.

It appears, then, that the treatment of χάρις as a quasi-substantial power, while it is most frequent in cases where the χάρις is viewed as resident in, or on a person, should not be restricted to these cases. In particular, Luke is quite ready to see that quasi-substantial power which he calls χάρις as present other than in a person, and is even prepared to locate it in connection with λόγος.

We may conclude therefore, that it would be natural for Luke to think of χάρις in Lk 4,22 as some kind of divine influence present in the words. Indeed a more precise sense for χάρις has emerged: the divine influence is to be conceived as a quasi-substantial power.

Τῆς χάριτος in Luke 4,22 is in fact Luke’s explanation to the reader. Luke has already introduced his readers to χάρις θεοῦ as a palpable presence of power with Jesus (Luke 2,40). He now cites the astonishment of the Nazareth folk as evidence that the same

⁽⁵¹⁾ Cf. Cambe’s comment re Acts 14,3; 20,24.32 (ΧΑΡΙΣ, 195) «Le message chrétien est l’annonce de la grâce faite par Dieu aux hommes; il la communique même aux croyants, car cette grâce est réellement présente dans la prédication et opère par elle».

⁽⁵²⁾ The same comment would apply to Luke 4,22. Jeremias’ view of χάρις at Luke 4,22 (*Promise*, 44-45) failed to meet this demand. His understanding of χάρις was not dynamic enough to embrace a possibility of χάρις coming to the hearers in the encounter. Just as the hearers can receive the words, so they can receive the χάρις.

χάρις adhered to his words⁽⁵³⁾. The people admit to the impact of the words on them, Luke wants his readers to see that it is the presence of χάρις which makes the impact understandable.

Regent College
2130 Wesbrook Mall
Vancouver, B.C., V6T 1W6, Canada

John L. NOLLAND

SOMMAIRE

Le contexte de notre discussion de l'expression «les paroles de grâce» est celui des questions que soulève l'interprétation de Lc 4, 16-30. Selon nous, l'expression représenterait un point de vue lucanien: c'est Luc et non les gens de Nazareth qui pensent que les paroles de Jésus sont paroles de la grâce; de plus, Luc concevrait la grâce comme une puissance divine, quasi-substantielle, présente dans les paroles de Jésus. Cette exégèse est confrontée d'abord avec le mouvement de la pensée dans le contexte immédiat, puis avec l'usage lucanien du vocabulaire.

(⁵³) CAMBE, ΧΑΡΙΣ, 200 draws attention here to the close connection between χάρις and πνεῦμα in Acts. That Jesus begins in Luke 4,18 with the assertion πνεῦμα Κυρίου ἐπ' ἐμέ, may not be insignificant in preparing the reader for χάρις in verse 22 as a presence of divine power. Note also in 4,32 the impact of the "word with authority/power".

Discipleship and Persecution: A Study of Luke 12,1-12

After examining Luke's two-volume work many conclude that the Third Gospel came into existence during a period free from persecution. Those who see a community suffering for its faith either ignore Luke 12,1-12⁽¹⁾ or provide an analysis of these verses similar to that suggested by those who argue for something other than a persecution *Sitz im Leben*⁽²⁾. It is the contention of this study that the gospel was composed in and for a time of persecution and that a detailed analysis of Luke 12,1-12 will support this position⁽³⁾.

The consensus among scholars that this unit, excluding verse 1, is Q material leaves unanswered the problem of the relation of the evangelist Luke to this section. Did he take over *en bloc* what he found in the tradition? Or, is this a combination of traditional material and Lukan redaction and composition? In the first stage of my argument it will be shown, on the basis of grammar, language, and style, that this section cannot be viewed as unredacted tradition taken over by the evangelist Luke. At this point one can affirm only in the broadest sense that 12,1-12 is Lukan. The second stage will consist of a detailed analysis of the unit in order to discern Lukan literary activity. It will be shown that: (a) Luke is responsible for the present location and form of this section, (b) Luke is addressing his readers who are under the threat of persecution, and (c) Luke's emphasis differs from that of his Q source.

⁽¹⁾ H. CONZELMANN, *The Theology of St. Luke*, trans. by Geoffrey BUSWELL (New York 1961) 129-132, 210. Charles H. TALBERT, *Luke and the Gnostics* (Nashville 1966) 77-78.

⁽²⁾ S. BROWN, *Apostasy and Perseverance in the Theology of Luke* (AnBib 36; Rome 1969) 45-56. The Lukan *Sitz im Leben* is, of course, complex with persecution being only one part of the picture.

⁽³⁾ For a representative bibliography of those who agree that the background for Luke-Acts is one of persecution, harassment, and distress, see R. J. KARRIS, "Missionary Communities: A New Paradigm for the Study of Luke-Acts", *CBQ* 41 (1979) 80-97, 84f. n. 14.

I. Luke 12,1-12 as Lukan

This section is concerned with showing that Luke 12,1-12 is from the same hand as the rest of the gospel. Certain familiar and distinctive Lukan constructions found throughout the gospel and Acts appear also in these verses.

(1) *Compound Verbs*: Comparison of the ratio of simple to compound verbs as well as direct comparison between Synoptic passages reveals a Lukan preference for the compound verb. The use of *syg-kekalymmenon* in verse 2 (cf. Matt 10,26) and *aparnēthēsetai* in verse 9 (cf. Matt 10,33) are examples of this characteristic⁽⁴⁾.

(2) *Future Passive*: Luke is known for his freedom in using the passive, especially the future passive. Twice in verse 3 (*akoushēsetai... kērychthēsetai*) and once in verse 9 (*aparnēthēsetai*) he uses the future passive. In the first instance Matt 10,27 has the aorist imperatives *eipate... kēryxate*. In the second, he uses *arnēsomai* (Matt 10,33)⁽⁵⁾.

(3) *Emphasis*: Often Luke furnishes the speech material with emphases and explanations⁽⁶⁾. Examples in this pericope are the *hētis estin hypokrisis* in 12,1, the *legō hymin* in 12,4.5.8, and the *hypodeixō hymin* in 12,5.

(4) *Other Devices*: Luke rarely if ever adds an unemphatic personal pronoun, and those he finds in his source he omits⁽⁷⁾. This trait can be seen in Luke 12,7 which does not contain the *hymeis* found in Matt 10,31. Often the Third Evangelist substitutes the participle, usually with the article, for a relative clause⁽⁸⁾. Two examples in this pericope are *ho de arnēsamenos me* in 12,9 (cf. Matt 10,33) and *tō... blasphemēsanti* in 12,10 (cf. Matt 12,32; Mark 3,29). Also considered a Lukan characteristic is the removal of a repeated article⁽⁹⁾. Examples of this trait can be seen in 12,10.12

(4) H. J. CADBURY, "The Style and Literary Method of Luke", *HTR* 6 (1920) 166f.

(5) CADBURY, "Style", 164f.

(6) Rudolf BULTMANN, *The History of the Synoptic Tradition*, trans. by John MARSH (New York 1963) 326f.

(7) CADBURY, "Style", 191.

(8) CADBURY, "Style", 135-136.

(9) CADBURY, "Style", 197.

when one compares *to hagian pneuma* with Mark 3,29, Matt 12,32, and Mark 13,11.

(5) *Vocabulary*: In addition to the presence of Lukan stylistic traits, the presence of typically Lukan language may indicate Lukan literary activity. Among the words which occur with great frequency in Luke-Acts the following occur in this pericope: (a) *pros* used of speaking to⁽¹⁰⁾, (b) *echō* with the infinitive⁽¹¹⁾, (c) *touton* = him⁽¹²⁾, (d) *meta tauta*⁽¹³⁾, and (e) *enōpion*⁽¹⁴⁾.

One must also consider words which occur less frequently but are exclusive to Luke-Acts. The following are examples of this category that occur in this pericope: (a) *en hois* (Luke 12,1; Acts 26,12), (b) *myrias* (Luke 12,1; Acts 19,19; 21,20), (c) *anth' hōn* (Luke 1,20; 12,3; 19,44; Acts 12,23)⁽¹⁵⁾, and (d) *archai* and *exousiai* as bearers of authority⁽¹⁶⁾.

Therefore, in terms of language and style, Luke 12,1-12 is from the same hand as the rest of the gospel. It is not simply a portion of the Q source taken over by Luke with little editorial activity. The manner in which he treats this material is similar, in general, to the way he deals with traditional material throughout Luke-Acts.

What must be determined now is what is the traditional material, what is Luke's reworking of the tradition, and what is Luke's own composition. It is necessary, therefore, to conduct a detailed analysis of Luke 12,1-12 in order to define more precisely Luke's literary activity in these verses.

⁽¹⁰⁾ Luke uses this expression 99 times in the gospel and 52 times in Acts. Matthew does not use it at all and Mark employs it only 5 times.

⁽¹¹⁾ This occurs 11 times in Luke-Acts (Luke 7,40.42; 12,4.50; 14,14; Acts 4,14; 23,17.18.19; 25,26; 27,19), never in Mark, and only in 18,25 in Matthew.

⁽¹²⁾ This expression occurs 7 times in Luke (9,26; 12,5; 19,14; 20,12.13; 23,2.18), 10 times in Acts, once in Matthew, and never in Mark.

⁽¹³⁾ This combination does not occur in Matthew or Mark. The 9 occurrences in Luke-Acts are: Luke 5,27; 10,1; 12,4; 17,8; 18,4; Acts 7,7 (LXX); 13,20; 15,16; 18,1. Nearly all are redactional.

⁽¹⁴⁾ Used 22 times in Luke and 13 times in Acts. This word is not used in Matthew or Mark.

⁽¹⁵⁾ This expression also occurs in 2 Thess 2,10.

⁽¹⁶⁾ This usage occurs elsewhere in the NT but not in the gospels.

II. Tradition and Redaction in Luke 12,1-12

(1) *Introductory Verses: 12,1-3*

The first of these introductory verses, 12,1, is easily divided: (a) a narrative section which serves as a transition from the previous section and an introduction to what follows, 12,1a, and (b) a dominical saying, 12,1b. Certain elements of the verse suggest that the first half is a Lukan composition, while the second half is the Lukan redaction of a traditional logion. Suggesting that 12,1a is a Lukan composition are: (a) *en hois* (see above)⁽¹⁷⁾, (b) *myrias* (see above), (c) *pros* used of speaking to (see above), (d) *katapateō*⁽¹⁸⁾, and (e) *prōton*⁽¹⁹⁾. There are no indications that Luke 12,1a contains traditional elements.

The introductory *en hois*, used as a transition from the scene at the Pharisee's dinner table, reminds the reader of the hostility of the

(17) The only other place this occurs, Acts 26,12, is regarded by most as a Lukan composition. Dibelius originally recognized that the speeches in Acts are basically the composition of the author of Acts. cf. G. LOHFINK, *Paulus vor Damaskus* (SBS 4; Stuttgart 1966) and E. SCHWEIZER, "Concerning the Speeches in Acts", *Studies in Luke-Acts*, ed. by L. E. KECK and L. MARTYN (Nashville 1966) 208-216.

(18) Luke uses this verb only here and in 8,5. The latter is obviously an editorial insertion into the Parable of the Sower (cf. Mark 4,1-9).

(19) In Mark 8,14ff Jesus and his disciples ("they") are alone in a boat. The warning against the leaven of the Pharisees is thus delivered only to the disciples with no others around. To say that Jesus spoke "first" to his disciples would make no sense in the Markan context. The setting for this saying in Matthew is similar to that in Mark. After he finishes speaking to those who ask him for a sign (Pharisees in Mark; Pharisees and Sadducees in Matthew), Jesus departs. Matthew makes the Markan "they" more specific as he refers to the "disciples". The saying does not take place in the boat, however, but on "the other side" of the lake. There is no indication in this pericope, Matt 16,5-12, that anyone other than the disciples and Jesus is present. The scene shifts immediately after this. It would be inconsistent with the Matthean context to say that Jesus was here addressing the disciples "first". Only in the Third Gospel setting does the use of *prōton* make sense. In Luke 12,1ff. Jesus is pictured as speaking "first" to the disciples (12,1-12), then to the multitude or one of the crowd (12,13-21), then to the disciples again (12,22-53), and once again to the crowd (12,54-13,9). The Third Evangelist is responsible for the framework of this section and for 12,1a which establishes the setting.

scribes and Pharisees (11,53-54) and prepares the way for Luke's comments on discipleship and persecution. Mention of the people gathered together causes the reader to recall the crowd which has been milling around since 11,14 and increasing since 11,29. This is not the same crowd however. It has grown to enormous proportions and is referred to as a *myrias*. Elsewhere Luke uses mild expressions like *ochlos polys* or *ochloi polloi*⁽²⁰⁾. By his editorial insertion, therefore, this becomes the largest crowd that the Lukan Jesus will address. In this way Luke indicates that 12,1 begins a separate and important section of the Travel Narrative.

In contrast to the first half of the verse the second half appears to be the redactional reworking of a traditional logion. This saying appears in a slightly different form in Matt 16,6 and Mark 8,15. Triple tradition agreement is found concerning the leaven of the Pharisees: *apo tēs zymēs tōn pharisaiōn*. The warning itself, however, takes a different form in each gospel. Mark uses *horate* and *blepete*. Matthew agrees with Mark in using *horate* but then disagrees by using *prosechete*. Luke only uses one verb, *prosechete*. A thorough examination of Luke's use of *prosechete apo*⁽²¹⁾ and *blepō*⁽²²⁾ suggests that Matthew and Luke knew this saying in a form slightly different than Mark 8,15. In any case, there is no indication that this is redactional.

Each of the Synoptics has a phrase peculiar to itself which is usually considered redactional. Matt 16,6 warns of the leaven of the Pharisees "and Sadducees"⁽²³⁾. Mark 8,15 warns of the "leaven of Herod"⁽²⁴⁾. The phrase *hētis estin hypokrisis* is usually seen as a

⁽²⁰⁾ CADBURY, "Style", 92.

⁽²¹⁾ *Blepete apo* occurs only in Mark 8,15 and 12,38. Luke's only uses of *prosechete apo* occur in the parallels, Luke 12,1b and 20,46. He uses *prosechō* eight more times but never in this phrase.

⁽²²⁾ Primarily Luke uses *blepō* as a substitute for *horaō*. He does, however, use it in 21,8 with the meaning "Take heed". Since he apparently felt comfortable following Mark there (cf. Mark 13,5), there is no reason to suspect he would have hesitated to use *blepō* in 12,1 or 20,46 had Mark been his only source.

⁽²³⁾ Matthew speaks of "Pharisees and Sadducees" 5 times and mentions both groups in the same sentence one other time. Mark and Luke only use the term once (Mark 12,18 = Luke 20,27). It is far more likely that Matthew added "Sadducees" here than that either Mark or Luke has omitted it.

⁽²⁴⁾ A variant reading, *tōn Hērōdianōn*, is a scribal alteration influenced by Mark 3,6 and 12,13 (cf. B. METZGER, *A Textual Commentary on the*

Lukan insertion. The word *hētis* is never used by Mark or John and appears only once in the First Gospel (Matt 27,62). Luke, on the other hand, employs it eight times in the gospel and five times in Acts⁽²⁵⁾.

As it exists in Mark, this saying lacks a direct explanation. Matthew defines the leaven as the "teaching of the Pharisees and Sadducees" in 16,12. Luke understands the leaven differently and explains it by his redactional addition, *hypokrisis*, and the Q material which follows.

The introductory verse to this section of the Third Gospel shows considerable Lukan redactional activity. He has taken over a traditional saying and provided both the setting and the explanation.

In contrast to 12,1, the following two verses show strong traditional and non-Lukan terminology. The entire section 12,2-9 appears to have existed in Q in the same order as it does in the Third Gospel (cf. Matth 10,26-33).

Verses 2-3 were originally independent logia which were joined in Q⁽²⁶⁾. Minor differences are the editorial *mē oun phobēthēte autous* in Matt 10,26⁽²⁷⁾, and the Lukan compound verb *sygkalyptō*. The logion in verse 3 has been modified by Matthew. By introducing the first person singular into the saying he intends to refer to the secret instruction the disciples received from Jesus. The Matthean

Greek New Testament [New York 1971] 98). W. KELBER has shown how the phrase "the leaven of Herod" can be explained by Mark's understanding of the opponents of Jesus (*The Kingdom in Mark* [Philadelphia 1974] 62). It is likely, therefore, that this phrase was added to the saying by Mark. For a different opinion see T. W. MANSON, *The Sayings of Jesus* (London 1949) 105.

⁽²⁵⁾ Luke 2,4.10; 7,37.39; 8,26.43; 10,42; 12,1; Acts 3,23 (= Deut 18,19); 11,28; 12,10; 16,12.16.

⁽²⁶⁾ BULTMANN, *History*, p. 83. Supporting this contention is the fact that verse 2 appears as an isolated logion in Mark 4,22 (= Luke 8,17). The tendency to combine independent logia is not exclusive to Q. Mark 4,21 appears as an isolated saying in Matt 5,15 = Luke 11,33. The general consensus with respect to Mark 4,21 and 4,22 is that these sayings were already united in the pre-Markan tradition. On this see V. TAYLOR, *The Gospel According to St. Mark* (New York 1966) 365 and KELBER, *Kingdom*, 29, 30, 31.

⁽²⁷⁾ BULTMANN, *History*, 91, 95.

Jesus tells the disciples to speak what they have heard in secret. The more original Lukan version warns that what one has spoken in secret will be heard⁽²⁸⁾. In spite of extensive linguistic agreement with Matt 10,27, there is evidence of Lukan redactional activity: (a) *anth' hōn* (see above, p. 63), (b) the inclusion of *en tois tameiois*⁽²⁹⁾, and (c) *pros* (see above, p. 63).

Lukan editorial involvement in verses 2-3 is slight and primarily stylistic in nature. He intends that these verses be understood in relation to their context which includes 12,1⁽³⁰⁾. The message is: Beware of hypocrisy, because *nothing* will remain hidden; even what you have secretly whispered will be revealed⁽³¹⁾.

(2) *A Warning*: 12,4-5

Luke 12,4 is related to Matt 10,28a and is a mixture of tradition and redaction. After the Lukan introduction⁽³²⁾, *legō de hymin tois philois mou*, there is exact linguistic agreement on the phrase "do not fear those who kill the body". The evangelists then disagree as Matthew continues, "but cannot kill the soul". Luke has, "and after that have no more that they can do". The Lukan ending appears redactional as it includes the characteristically Lukan *meta tau-ta* and *echō* with the infinitive (see above, p. 63).

Luke has reworked the tradition in verse 5 and included his own introduction and conclusion. The opening phrase, 12,5a, "But

⁽²⁸⁾ BULTMANN, *History*, 95.

⁽²⁹⁾ This expression provides a good antithesis to *epi tōn dōmatōn* and would not likely have been omitted by Matthew.

⁽³⁰⁾ Some argue that verse 3 refers to the power of the gospel. Thus RENGSTORF, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (NTD 3; Göttingen ³1937), suggests verses 2-3 refer to the disciple's message which is so powerful it will automatically be made manifest. LAMPE, *Luke* (Peake's Commentary on the Bible [M. BLACK ed.]; London 1962) 820-843, 834, maintains: "The Pharisees' hypocrisy is to be unmasked by the proclamation of the Gospel, which will ultimately be announced publicly and unmistakably". Both suggestions are incompatible with the Lukan context.

⁽³¹⁾ For a similar interpretation see A. PLUMMER, *The Gospel According to S. Luke* (ICC; Edinburgh ⁵1964) 318, J. M. CREED, *The Gospel According to St. Luke* (London 1957) 170f, J. SCHMID, *Das Evangelium nach Lucas* (RNT 3; Regensburg ⁴1960) 215, and W. GRUNDMANN, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (THKNT III; Berlin 1963) 235.

⁽³²⁾ On *legō hymin* see above, I (3). On *philos*, see below.

I will warn you whom to fear", contains the characteristically Lukan verb *hypodeiknymi*⁽³³⁾. Certain elements of 12,5b also appear to be redactional: (a) *exousia* (*echein*)⁽³⁴⁾, and *embalein eis tēn geennan*⁽³⁵⁾. The concluding phrase, 12,5c, contains the following Lukanisms mentioned above: (a) *nai legō hymin*⁽³⁶⁾, and (b) *touton* = him.

The extensive editorial revision in 12,4-5 serves to highlight the only statement left untouched: "Do not fear those who kill the body". Luke did not need to reword this because it said precisely what he wanted it to say: Don't fear those who are persecuting you. The present active participle, *apokteinontōn*, conveys Luke's meaning well. He did emphasize this statement, however, by his added introduction.

The reference to the disciples in verse 4a is more than merely a stylistic reminder of the audience Jesus is addressing. This is the only time in the Synoptics that the disciples are called the "friends" of Jesus. The use of *philos* here could betray Lukan acquaintance with the Johannine tradition. Members of the Johannine community were referred to as "friends"⁽³⁷⁾. Jesus explicitly calls the disciples his "friends" because he made "known to them what he heard

(33) See above, I (1) (3). This verb is not used at all by Mark and appears in Matthew only in 3,7 (= Luke 3,7). The use of this verb in Luke 6,47 is also probably redactional (cf. Matt 7,24). Cf. also CREED, *Luke*, 171.

(34) This combination is found twice in Matt (7,29; 9,6) but in both instances he is dependent on Mark (1,22; 2,10). The Third Gospel uses this combination 3 times (Luke 5,24; 12,5; 19,17) and it occurs once in Acts (9,14). Although in 5,24 Luke depends on Mark 2,10, the other occurrence of *exousia* (*echein*) in 19,17 is probably redactional. The evidence does not allow one to claim that this is a characteristic phrase found in Q. The logical conclusion is that this combination is the result of Lukan involvement.

(35) The fact that this is the only NT use of *emballō* and the only Lukan use of *geenna* make conclusions difficult. The LXX does use *emballō* extensively however. Similar to Luke's understanding of *geenna* are the uses of *emballō* in Jer 22,7 ("Cast them into the fire") and Dan 3. In the latter one reads several times "cast them into a burning fiery furnace". The association of *geenna* with fire was made for Luke in Mark 9,43ff, a passage Luke omits. This evidence leads to the conclusion that the use of *emballō* here may very well be editorial.

(36) This occurs with the *nai* also in Luke 7,26 and 11,51.

(37) R. A. CULPEPPER, *The Johannine School* (SBL Dissertation Series 26; Missoula 1975) 272. Culpepper shows that a similar understanding existed in Greek Hellenistic sources, especially the Epicurean school.

from the Father, but the title was also dependent upon their doing what he commanded”⁽³⁸⁾. This understanding of *philos* fits well with the Lukan context. Jesus has revealed to his disciples what was delivered to him by the Father (Luke 10,21-22). The disciple is then required to do what Jesus commanded. The reader of the Third Gospel is told in the verses which follow what Jesus commanded in time of persecution⁽³⁹⁾. The Lukan community is being addressed in its present situation.

Luke is concerned that his readers not focus all their attention on persecution and the possibility of death. Persecution is only one part of a larger picture. There is something more involved here⁽⁴⁰⁾. The eschatological thrust of verse 5 is obvious. This causes the entire section, 12,1-5, and the warnings contained therein to be viewed in light of the coming judgement. Luke emphasizes that fear of eschatological judgement and not fear of persecution should be the motivating factor for one's actions.

(3) Assurance of God's Concern: 12,6-7

Verse 6 appears to be a combination of tradition and redaction. The first half of the verse is almost identical to Matt 10,29a. The only difference is in the number of sparrows and their cost⁽⁴¹⁾. Both evangelists agree in using “not one of them” but disagree on what

⁽³⁸⁾ CULPEPPER, *School*, 272.

⁽³⁹⁾ The use of *philos* in Luke 21,16 also suggests that the Third Evangelist understood this term to refer to the followers of Jesus in a technical sense. The disciples are told that in the time for bearing testimony (Luke 21,13) they will be delivered up by parents, brothers, kinsmen, and *friends* (Luke 20,16). Some of the disciples, Jesus adds, will be put to death. “Friends” is a redactional insertion here. It should be taken to mean that fellow Christians will be responsible for handing over some for persecution and death. Luke could also be alluding here to the paradigmatic martyrdom of Jesus who was betrayed by one of his “friends”. The same verb, *paradi-dōmi*, is used in 21,16 and 22,48 for the handing over by “friends” for persecution and death.

⁽⁴⁰⁾ It is possible that *perissoteros* in 12,4c is Lukan. Luke uses it several times (usually when found in a source) and Matthew only uses it in 11,9 (Q). The use of *meta* (after) in 12,5b also suggests this.

⁽⁴¹⁾ Luke has 5 sparrows sold for 2 pennies whereas Matthew has 2 sparrows sold for one penny.

follows. Matthew concludes, "will fall to the ground without your Father's will". Luke's version reads, "is forgotten before God". The original saying is difficult to reconstruct as the typically Matthean *tou patros hymōn*⁽⁴²⁾ and the characteristically Lukan *enōpion*⁽⁴³⁾ suggest redactional activity by both evangelists⁽⁴⁴⁾.

The differences between Luke 12,7 and Matthew 10,31 are slight and unimportant⁽⁴⁵⁾. The argument is that since God cares for mere sparrows, and the disciples are worth more than many of these, he will obviously care for the disciples also.

Because these verses contain much traditional material, the Lukan addition that the persecuted will not be "forgotten before God" is highlighted. The use of *epilanthanomai* in verse 6 is apparently meant to assure those suffering and undergoing persecution that God will not forget this at the final judgement. This judgement theme, implicit as early as verses 2-3, also includes, at least secondarily, the threat of a negative verdict. Neither will God forget hypocrisy or those who let fear of persecution determine their actions. As a positive reassurance this supports the injunction not to be afraid in verse 4.

(4) *Promise and Threat: 12,8-10*

Luke 12,8 bears striking resemblance to Matt 10,32. Luke is responsible for the introduction, *legō de hymin*⁽⁴⁶⁾, and the conclusion, "the angels of God"⁽⁴⁷⁾. He probably is following his source,

⁽⁴²⁾ Matthew uses the term "Father" with reference to God over 40 times (Luke 15 times; Mark 4 times), often with modifiers such as "my", "your", "heavenly", "who is in heaven".

⁽⁴³⁾ See above, n. 14.

⁽⁴⁴⁾ Further support is found in Matt 6,26 (Luke 12,24). These verses also refer to birds. The Matthean version contains the familiar *ho patēr hymōn ho ouranios* while the Third Gospel has *ho theos*. The logical conclusion is that Luke himself is responsible for the reference to "God" while Matthew is to be credited with employing "your Father".

⁽⁴⁵⁾ The word order concerning *hymōn* differs; Matthew includes *eisin* and Luke does not; Matthew has *de kai* while Luke has *alla kai*; Matthew includes the words *oun* and *hymeis*.

⁽⁴⁶⁾ See above, I (3).

⁽⁴⁷⁾ This phrase does not appear in Matt 10,32. The frequency of Matthew's use of "Father" to refer to God and of the accompanying phrase

however, in not explicitly identifying Jesus and the "Son of Man"⁽⁴⁸⁾. The fact that Matthew uses the first person pronoun in both clauses is usually seen as redactional on his part⁽⁴⁹⁾.

Denial rather than acknowledgement is the subject of verse 9 which parallels Matt 10,33 and is similar in form to the preceding verse, 12,8. Lukan involvement here includes the use of: (a) *aparneomai*⁽⁵⁰⁾, (b) *enōpion*⁽⁵¹⁾, and (c) *tōn aggelōn tou theou*⁽⁵²⁾.

Notoriously difficult to interpret, Luke 12,10 is related to Matt 12,31-32 and Mark 3,28-29. Most scholars agree that this saying existed in Mark and Q in different forms. Comparing Matthew and Luke one finds the following linguistic agreement: (a) *logon*⁽⁵³⁾, (b) followed by the singular "Son of Man"⁽⁵⁴⁾, (c) followed by *aphethēsetai autō*⁽⁵⁵⁾, and (d) *ouk aphethēsetai*. Luke appears to have been influenced also by the Markan form of the saying. This conclusion results from the fact that the only two occurrences of *blasphēmēō eis* in the New Testament are in these verses, Luke 12,10 and Mark 3,29. Lukan stylistic traits here are: (a) substituting the participle with the article, *tō... blasphēmēsanti*, for a relative clause (see above, I (4)), and (b) removing a repeated article (Luke 12,10 has *to hagian pneuma*, see above, *ibidem*).

It is readily apparent that Matthew 12,31-32 is a combination of the Q and Markan forms of this saying. Less obvious is the influence of Mark 3,29 on Luke 12,10, mentioned above. This is easily overlooked because Luke does not follow Mark in joining this logion to the Beelzebul story as Matthew did. While the Markan

"who is in heaven" suggest Matthean redaction. This exact phrase appears only in Luke 12,8 and 15,10. The later is in a verse which displays definite signs of Lukan involvement. It seems likely, therefore, that this phrase owes its origin to the redactor.

⁽⁴⁸⁾ Similarly, Mark 8,38 = Luke 9,26.

⁽⁴⁹⁾ The fact that he omits Mark 8,38 from his gospel also suggests this.

⁽⁵⁰⁾ See above, I (1). This change to the compound verb avoids repeating *arneomai*.

⁽⁵¹⁾ See above, n. 14. While *emprosthen* appears in Matthew and Luke, *enōpion* is distinctively Lukan.

⁽⁵²⁾ The same phrase which concluded verse 8.

⁽⁵³⁾ Mark does not use *logon* here.

⁽⁵⁴⁾ Mark 3,28 employs the plural *tois huiōis tōn anthrōpōn*.

⁽⁵⁵⁾ Matthew's use of *aphethēsetai* in 12,31 depends on Mark 3,28.

form is usually judged more original⁽⁵⁶⁾, the present location of this saying in both Mark and Luke is widely recognized as secondary⁽⁵⁷⁾.

The material presently located in Luke 12,2-9 (= Matt 10,26-33) is in the same order as it must have been in Q. Verses 8-9, therefore, would have been given special emphasis as concluding verses. Käsemann believes that Luke 12,8-9 represent the Q community's use of a specific eschatological form found throughout the New Testament, the *Satz heiligen Rechts*⁽⁵⁸⁾. One of the distinguishing characteristics of the "sentence of holy law" is that judgement is not executed in the present but on the Last Day. This eschatological *lex talionis* emphasizes that one's present actions relate directly to one's future destiny. The phrase "before the angels of God" supports the contention that the last judgement is meant⁽⁵⁹⁾.

In adding verse 10 (and verses 11-12, see below) Luke has retained the eschatological thrust of this unit and emphasized the importance of the final judgement for one's present actions⁽⁶⁰⁾. Both sayings warn of the ultimate danger of apostasy in the face of persecution. The question that remains to be answered is why Luke added verse 10 here.

(56) BULTMANN, *History*, 131, states that the Markan "sons of men" originally was "son of man, i.e. men". In its original form the saying explained that every sin could be forgiven the son of man (men) except blasphemy against the Holy Spirit. The Q version arose from a misunderstanding of the expression "son of man". It must have been assumed that this meant the "Son of Man". What resulted was the strange saying one now finds in Matthew and Luke. Everyone who speaks a word against the Son of Man will be forgiven, but blasphemy against the Holy Spirit will not be forgiven.

(57) The use of *pas hos* to begin verses 8 and 10 is probably redactional. Although these are the only two occurrences of this exact expression in the gospels and Acts, Luke 14,33 does have *pas ex hymōn hos*.

(58) E. KÄSEMANN, "Sentences of Holy Law in the New Testament", *New Testament Questions of Today* (Philadelphia 1969) 66-81.

(59) KITTEL, *TDNT*, p. 84, asserts: "The active participation of angels seems to be most strongly assumed in relation to the events of the last time". Luke associates angels and final judgement in 9,23 where he is dependent on Mark 8,38. JEREMIAS, *The Parables of Jesus* (New York 1963) 135, n. 11, believes this expression is a paraphrase for the divine name and resulted from the fusion of two circumlocutions.

(60) Surely the act of forgiveness (future tense) is meant to be eschatological.

Luke 12,9 tells the reader that anyone who denies Jesus will be denied at the final judgement. The only other action that has such irreversible consequences is mentioned in verse 10. The Third Evangelist must have understood verse 12,10b as a parallel to verse 9. To deny Jesus is equivalent to blaspheming against the Holy Spirit. By placing this saying after verse 9 Luke has emphasized what is unforgivable and not what is forgivable.

If denial of Jesus is unforgivable, how does one account for Peter's reinstatement and the forgiveness of the Jews mentioned in Acts 3,13-14? The clue to Luke's intent is found in the latter example where forgiveness is possible because the sin was committed in ignorance (Acts 3,17ff). Similarly, in Acts 17,30 Paul tells the Athenians that there were "times of ignorance God overlooked, but now he commands all men everywhere to repent". When was ignorance an excuse? What is the dividing line?

The confusion here is eliminated when one realizes the importance of the Pentecost event for Luke. It is only at Pentecost that the Holy Spirit is poured forth. Blasphemy against the Holy Spirit is only possible after Pentecost⁽⁶¹⁾. The parallel created by Luke between verses 9 and 10b leads to the conclusion that the unforgivable denial of Jesus is also a post-Pentecost sin. That the sin against the Holy Spirit is one committed by Christians can be seen in the story of Ananias and Sapphira (Acts 5,1ff)⁽⁶²⁾ and in the location of Luke 12,10 by the evangelist. In both Matthew and Mark this logion is addressed to the opponents. The Lukan context leaves no doubt that this unforgivable sin is committed by apostate Christians who deny Jesus in the hour of persecution⁽⁶³⁾.

If the unforgivable sin is committed by Christians then the forgivable sin mentioned in 12,10a is probably committed by non-Christians. Edwards suggests that the Q community would have seen this saying as an offer of hope to Jews and others outside the community⁽⁶⁴⁾. Ultimate forgiveness was assured those properly

⁽⁶¹⁾ Similarly G. BORNKAMM, *Jesus von Nazareth* (Stuttgart 1956) 194.

⁽⁶²⁾ Luke mentions no one in his writings who "blasphemes" against the Holy Spirit. Acts 5,1ff, however, does speak about individuals who lie or tempt the Holy Spirit. Elsewhere, Christians are exhorted neither to "grieve the Holy Spirit" (Eph 4,20) nor to "quench the Spirit" (1 Thess 5,19).

⁽⁶³⁾ Similarly, LAMPE, *Luke*, 834.

⁽⁶⁴⁾ R. A. EDWARDS, *The Theology of Q* (Philadelphia 1976) 122.

prepared members of the community. Therefore, the Son of Man would forgive the pre-conversion sins of new members⁽⁶⁵⁾. Luke's understanding of 12,10a is similar, but he is not concerned here with the forgivable sin.

By adding verse 10 here Luke has done three things: (a) emphasized the fact that it is possible to commit an unforgivable sin⁽⁶⁶⁾, (b) directed this section, 12,1ff, clearly to Christians in a post-Pentecost situation, i.e. the Lukan community, and (c) used a traditional saying to introduce the Holy Spirit into the context. This allowed him to add verses 11-12 which ultimately determine the overall message of this pericope.

(5) *Reassurance: 12,11-12*

Luke 12,11 is the result of the Third Evangelist's reworking of Mark 13,11 and the Q saying found in Matt 10,19-20. Matthew and Luke agree on the use of: (a) *hotan de* (against Mark's *kai hotan*), and (b) *mē merimnēsēte pōs ē ti* (against Mark's *mē promerimnate ti*). Matthew and Mark agree against Luke in using: (a) *paradidōmi* (Luke has *eispherō*), and (b) *lalēsate* (Luke has *apologeomai*)⁽⁶⁷⁾. Luke alone has Jesus inform the disciples that they will be brought before "the synagogues and the rulers and the authorities". The Lukan hand is evident here as both *archai* and *exousiai*, as human bearers of authority, appear in Luke-Acts but not in the other gospels (see above, I (5)). Also probably Lukan is the concluding phrase, *ē ti eipēte*. This is absent from the Matthean and Markan parallels and is balanced with a similar phrase, *ē ti apologēsēsthe*.

Luke appears to have composed verse 12 on the basis of Mark 13,11 as there is no evidence which would suggest that this is Q

⁽⁶⁵⁾ Cf. also A. Fridrichsen who believes the original meaning of this saying is linked to the Jewish mission of the church. The Jews could be forgiven their sins of ignorance against Jesus, but not their disobedience to the Spirit who was active in the apostolic preaching. This position and numerous other interpretations of verse 10 are mentioned in I. H. MARSHALL, "Hard Sayings VII. Luke 12,10", *Th* 67 (1974) 65-66.

⁽⁶⁶⁾ This motif is present earlier although not as explicitly.

⁽⁶⁷⁾ The verb *apologeomai* appears only here in 12,11 and in Luke 21,14.

material. The Third Evangelist agrees with Mark in referring to the "Holy Spirit" against Matthew's "the Spirit of your Father". The exact wording differs and can be attributed to Luke's characteristic removal of the repeated article (see above, I (4)).

Matthew and Mark agree in using: (a) *didōmi*, (b) *hymīn en ekeinē tē hōra*, and (c) *laleō*. Both continue further than Luke and in almost exact linguistic agreement. The obvious conclusion is that Matthew relied heavily on Mark 13,11 here.

Although linguistic evidence that Luke is dependent on Mark is almost non-existent here, this conclusion can be reached after examining Luke 21,12ff. As in the verses just discussed, here too one is told that disciples will be brought before certain individuals or groups and will have questions put to them. The disciples are not to be anxious or wonder what they will say because at that time help will be provided. Luke 21,12ff is clearly a redactional reworking of Mark 13,9ff⁽⁶⁸⁾. Equally obvious is the fact that Luke says essentially the same thing in 12,11-12 as he does in 21,14-15. Therefore, Luke 12,11-12 is best seen as the redactional reworking of Mark 13,9ff with verse 11 being influenced slightly by a Q version of the saying.

It is important to remember the Lukan context for 12,11-12 and 21,12ff. Unlike Mark 13,3ff, where Jesus speaks only to Peter, James, John and Andrew, both Lukan sayings are delivered to a larger audience of disciples. In Luke 21 the disciples are told there will be persecutions as they are brought to synagogues and prisons. Jesus will provide help at the time of interrogation. The disciple has only to endure this persecution to receive an eschatological reward. Luke 12,11-12 conveys a similar message and likewise addresses disciples as they face persecution.

Luke has added verses 11-12 here to avoid ending this section on a threatening note. By repeating *to hagion pneuma* (verses 10.12)

⁽⁶⁸⁾ Lukan redactional elements are: (a) *pro de toutōn pantōn* (so C. H. TALBERT, "The Redaction Critical Quest for Luke the Theologian", *Jesus and Man's Hope*, I [Pittsburgh 1970] 182), (b) *epiballō* (three of the four other uses are clearly redactional), and (c) *apobainō* (used only twice in the NT). In both instances Luke follows Mark and uses: (1) *paradidōmi*, (2) *eis... synagōgas*, (3) "kings and governors", (4) *heneken*, and (5) slightly changes Mark's "for my sake" into "for my name's sake", which agrees with Luke 21,17 (= Mark 13,13 = Matt 24,9b).

he reassures the disciple that there is no need to fear committing the unforgivable sin while undergoing questioning or persecution. For it is the same Holy Spirit that will teach them what they are to say.

III. Conclusion

Two of the foremost proponents of a persecution *Sitz im Leben* for the gospel, H. Conzelmann and C. Talbert⁽⁶⁹⁾, virtually ignore Luke 12,1-12. They focus their attention on Chapter 21 and overlook the relationship between 12,1-12 and 21,12-19. This is difficult to understand given the numerous areas of contact: (a) the audience is the same⁽⁷⁰⁾, (b) the Lukan community is addressed by the frequent use of the second person form of address — these uses are redactional⁽⁷¹⁾, (c) the editorial insertion of *philos*⁽⁷²⁾, (d) the concern with the physical death of disciples⁽⁷³⁾, (e) the use of *thrix* (*triches*) *ek tēs kephalēs hymōn*⁽⁷⁴⁾, (f) both talk of disciples being brought before (to) synagogues and before temporal authorities, who will question them⁽⁷⁵⁾, (g) the only uses of *apologeomai* in the gospels⁽⁷⁶⁾, (h) the warning against being overly concerned before interrogation⁽⁷⁷⁾, and (i) the promise that help will be given during any interrogation⁽⁷⁸⁾. This abundance of evidence suggests that Luke 12,1-12

⁽⁶⁹⁾ See note 1.

⁽⁷⁰⁾ The Markan audience in 3,28-29 (= Luke 12,10) is the opponents while the audience in 13,9ff (= Luke 21,12ff) is a select group of four disciples.

⁽⁷¹⁾ Numerous times in 21,16-19 and in the redactional additions in 12,4.5.8.12.

⁽⁷²⁾ Luke 12,4 and 21,16.

⁽⁷³⁾ Luke 12,4 and 21,16.

⁽⁷⁴⁾ The only other uses of *thrix* by Luke are in 7,38 (*thrixin tēs kephalēs autēs*), 7,44 (*thrixin autēs*), and Acts 27,34 (*thrix apo tēs kephalēs*).

⁽⁷⁵⁾ Luke 12,11 reads, “before... the rulers and the authorities”. Luke 21,12 has, “before kings and governors”.

⁽⁷⁶⁾ Luke 12,11 and 21,14.

⁽⁷⁷⁾ Luke 12,11 has, “do not be anxious”. Luke 21,14 reads, “settle it in your minds therefore not to meditate beforehand”.

⁽⁷⁸⁾ Luke 12,12 reads, “the Holy Spirit will teach you in that very hour what you ought to say”. Luke 21,15 has Jesus say, “I will give you a mouth and wisdom which none of your adversaries will be able to withstand or contradict”.

and 21,16-19 are both concerned with the current persecution facing the Lukan community⁽⁷⁹⁾.

Although Schuyler Brown⁽⁸⁰⁾ also believes the gospel was written in response to the persecution of the Lukan community, his analysis of 12,1-12 is typical of scholars who argue for something other than a persecution *Sitz im Leben*. Luke 12,2-9 is said to foretell the situation of the disciples' future ministry. From this assumption it is argued that 12,10 was added to inform the disciples that whoever blasphemes the spirit, at work in the disciples and their ministry, commits the unforgivable sin. The setting, therefore, is missionary and the unpardonable sin the rejection of the apostolic preaching. It has been shown throughout this paper that the situation is one of persecution and that the Lukan community is being addressed. Blasphemy against the Holy Spirit was also shown to be a sin committed by Christians and not non-Christians.

G.W.H. Lampe⁽⁸¹⁾ seems to suggest a compromise position. He argues that 12,10 has been set in the context of witness under persecution and that it is the apostate who commits the unforgivable sin. On the other hand, he holds that 12,3 is concerned with the proclamation of the gospel. "God", says Lampe, "will exert his protective care over the faithful disciple, even in persecution⁽⁸²⁾". Apparently he believes that the setting is missionary and that persecution is dealt with in a hypothetical sense. It was shown earlier that the persecution facing the Lukan community was real and, in fact, may have been one of the reasons the gospel was written. The interpretation of 12,3 which lies behind Lampe's understanding of this sec-

⁽⁷⁹⁾ Luke's use of persecution material is not limited to the gospel but occurs in Acts as well, especially in relation to Paul. Paul admits that he flogged Christians "in every synagogue" (Acts 22,19) and compelled many by force to blaspheme in "synagogue after synagogue" (26,11) (cf. *synagōgas* in Luke 12,11 and 21,12). Paul states that he had the authority (*exousia*; cf. Luke 12,11) to send Christians to prison (*phylakē*; cf. Luke 21,12). In Acts 12,1 we read that King Herod (on *basileis* cf. 21,12) persecuted the church. And in Acts 23-26 we find Paul before Agrippa the *basileus* and Felix the *hēgemōn* (cf. Luke 21,12). What happens in Acts is what was mentioned in Luke 12 and 21.

⁽⁸⁰⁾ See note 2, especially pp. 107ff.

⁽⁸¹⁾ See note 29.

⁽⁸²⁾ LAMPE, *Luke*, 834.

tion was mentioned previously as being at odds with the present context.

There can be no doubt that Luke is responsible for the present location and form of this section. By adding verses 1 and 10-12 to the Q unit now located in Luke 12,2-9, the Third Evangelist has: (a) provided a smooth and logical transition from the previous scene, (b) provided a smooth and logical transition to the following scene,⁽⁸³⁾ (c) emphasized the importance of Luke 12,1ff, and (d) provided the interpretive context for verses 2-9.

The Q material here is not merely unredacted tradition taken over by the evangelist. By his editorial activity in verses 2-9 Luke has: (a) clearly directed these words of Jesus to members of his community as they stand under the threat of persecution, (b) emphasized that one's actions must not be based on fear of the persecutor and physical death, and (c) assured the reader that God will not forget steadfastness in the face of persecution.

It appears that the Q unit was understood primarily as a warning or threat. The few words of confidence (verses 6-8) are completely surrounded by verses with ominous overtones (verses 2-5 and 9). In spite of the balancing nature of verses 8 and 9, it is the negative promise which apparently ended this section in Q. By adding verses 10-12 Luke has chosen to highlight the positive rather than the negative. While verse 10 does continue the threatening tone of 12,2-9 its primary purpose is to prepare the way for verses 11-12. These verses indicate that the main theme here is reassurance. The reader of Luke 12,1-12 is told that the Holy Spirit will help to prevent the commission of the unforgivable sin.

This emphasis on reassurance is not exclusive to Luke 12,1-12, but is found elsewhere in the Third Gospel. Two examples will suffice.

In Luke 12,22-34 we learn that God provides for the birds and flowers; since the disciples are more valuable than either of these, God will certainly provide them with what they need. The disciple has only one task, to prepare for the coming of the kingdom by living according to its requirements⁽⁸⁴⁾. By adding 12,32 Luke has

⁽⁸³⁾ See comments on *prōton*. In addition, Luke uses *merimnaō* only in Chapter 12 (verses 11,22,25,26) and in 10,41.

⁽⁸⁴⁾ J. REILING and J. L. SWELLENGREBEL, *A Translator's Handbook on the Gospel of Luke* (Leiden 1971) 480.

recalled both the persecution context⁽⁸⁵⁾ and the reassurance of divine care⁽⁸⁶⁾. God will give the kingdom to his "little flock"⁽⁸⁷⁾.

In the sending out of the seventy (-two) disciples (10,1ff) Luke reports Jesus' words of warning to the Galilean towns (verses 13-16). When these missionaries return (verses 17-20) their joy over their missionary success is redirected by Jesus. The real ground for their joy is that their names are written in heaven (10,20). This pattern of reassurance after the threat of eternal punishment was seen in 12,1-12. Both passages owe their present form to Luke's editorial activity. The reassuring word of 10,20 also reminds one of the desire of God to give the disciples the kingdom which was mentioned in 12,32. Judgement for the Christian who rejects Jesus will involve Hades or Gehenna. But this horrible end can be averted. God wants to give the disciples the kingdom. Indeed, their names are already written in heaven.

For the Third Evangelist, then, discipleship includes positive action as evidence of one's faith. This involves repentance (10,13-16; 11,29-32; 12,57-13,9), seeking security in God and not in possessions (12,13-21), and the public acknowledgement of Jesus (12,8-9). The danger facing the disciples is apostasy for which there will be no forgiveness (12,10). Although this danger is very real, the faithful disciple is told not to be anxious, for God will provide ultimate protection (11,13; 12,12,22f). Indeed, the appropriate response of the faithful disciples to persecution is joy (cf. 6,22f; Acts 13,50ff) because their names are written in heaven (10,20) and God wants to give them the kingdom (12,32).

Saint Anselm College
Manchester, NH 03102
U.S.A.

Dennis M. SWEETLAND

⁽⁸⁵⁾ Cf. the use of *phobeomai* in 12,4.5.7.

⁽⁸⁶⁾ Cf. Luke 12,12.

⁽⁸⁷⁾ The use of *poimnion* in Acts 20,28-29 reminds one of the situation in the Lukan community. The flock will be threatened by fellow Christians "speaking perverse things".

SOMMAIRE

Cette étude se propose de montrer, à l'aide de Lc 12,1-12, que l'Évangile de Luc fut composé en et pour un temps de persécution. 1) La grammaire, le vocabulaire et le style montrent que ce passage ne peut être une tradition reprise par Luc sans modification. 2) Une analyse détaillée révèle l'activité rédactionnelle de Luc: a) la forme et la place du passage reviennent à Luc; b) l'Évangéliste s'adresse à des lecteurs menacés par la persécution et c) il n'insiste pas sur les mêmes points que sa source Q.

ANIMADVERSIONES

L'organisation du Livre des Actes et de l'ensemble de l'œuvre de Luc

Si l'on peut parler d'une certaine unanimité parmi les exégètes sur le plan du troisième évangile, l'accord est loin d'être réalisé sur celui des Actes des Apôtres.

* * *

En ce qui concerne le premier volume de l'œuvre de Luc, la situation est bien décrite par J. Dupont dans un article récent: «On s'accorde facilement pour reconnaître que le récit évangélique est construit sur un schéma géographique en trois grandes parties: ministère de Jésus en Galilée, voyage vers Jérusalem, événements de Jérusalem; on s'accorde même pour faire commencer la partie centrale en Lc 9,51, mais il n'y a plus d'accord sur le point exact où elle se termine. On constate en même temps que cette disposition est essentiellement commandée par la documentation dont Luc dispose: le plan général étant celui de Marc, les matériaux venus d'ailleurs servent surtout à étoffer la section du voyage»⁽¹⁾.

Cette unanimité vient, il est vrai, d'être rompue par P. Bossuyt et J. Radermakers, qui dans leur commentaire⁽²⁾ établissent les divisions majeures de l'évangile de Luc en 5,1; 9,18; 17,11; 22,1. Il n'y a, pour eux, qu'un arrêt mineur du récit en 3,1, rien de nouveau en 9,51⁽³⁾, et une division secondaire en 19,28, au moment où s'achève le voyage vers Jérusalem. Mais comme ces auteurs n'ont donné nulle part de justification systématique de ces positions originales et surprenantes, il sera prudent de ne pas se laisser impressionner par elles.

Mieux vaut s'en tenir au plan classique⁽⁴⁾. La mission de Jésus se dérou-

⁽¹⁾ J. DUPONT, «La question du plan des Actes des Apôtres à la lumière d'un texte de Lucien de Samosate», *NT* 21 (1979) 220-231 (texte cité, 222).

⁽²⁾ P. BOSSUYT - J. RADERMAKERS, *Jésus Parole de la Grâce selon saint Luc*, T. 1, *Texte*, T. 2, *Lecture continue* (Bruxelles 1981).

⁽³⁾ Ce traitement de Lc 9,51 est d'autant plus surprenant que le commentaire en question nous rappelle que «toute la tradition voit dans ce verset un moment-clef du troisième évangile» (BOSSUYT-RADERMAKERS, T. 2, 272).

⁽⁴⁾ La présentation la plus judicieuse du plan de l'évangile de Luc nous semble être celle qu'a faite A. GEORGE, *Lecture de l'évangile selon saint Luc* (Lyon 1971) 11-18. Cet opuscule reprend et modifie l'article technique du même auteur, «Tradition et rédaction chez Luc. La construction du troisième évangile», dans I. DE LA POTTERIE [éd.], *De Jésus aux évangiles. Tradition et Rédaction dans les Évangiles synoptiques* (Gembloux 1967) 100-129.

le en trois temps: en Galilée (4,14 - 9,50), vers Jérusalem (9,51 - 19,28), à Jérusalem (19,29 - 24,53). C'est le schéma par lequel Luc lui-même résume deux fois l'activité de Jésus: «Il soulève le peuple en enseignant - par toute la Judée - à partir de la Galilée - jusqu'ici» (Lc 23,5); «L'événement a gagné la Judée entière; il a commencé par la Galilée, après le baptême proclamé par Jean (...) et nous sommes témoins de toute son œuvre sur le territoire des Juifs comme à Jérusalem» (Ac 10,37.39). Pour Luc, il y a un point de départ: la Galilée (Lc 23,49.55; Ac 13,31), et un point d'arrivée: Jérusalem (Lc 9,51; 13,22; 13,33; 17,11; 19,28; Ac 13,31); entre les deux, une extension du message dans «toute la Judée», autrement dit sur «tout le territoire des Juifs».

Le baptême proclamé par Jean - en Judée et non en Galilée - constitue l'ouverture de l'évangile, le prélude à la mission de Jésus, qui reçoit l'Esprit-Saint pour l'accomplir. Le «commencement» de Jésus dont parle Ac 1,1 peut donc être situé dès le moment du baptême (Lc 3,23; Ac 1,21-22), indissociable de la première prédication de Jésus à Nazareth (Lc 4,18)⁽⁵⁾.

Les récits de l'enfance forment un bloc à part. Ils constituent un prologue à l'ensemble de l'œuvre lucanienne, Évangile et Actes. C'est le temps des préparations prophétiques. Dans ce prologue, plusieurs personnages sont «remplis de l'Esprit-Saint»: le futur Jean-Baptiste (Lc 1,15), sa mère Élisabeth (1,41), son père Zacharie (1,67), le vieillard Siméon (2,25). Le dessein de Dieu en son entier est révélé à Siméon d'une manière explicite: «Mes yeux ont vu ton salut, que tu as préparé à la face de tous les peuples: lumière pour la révélation aux païens et gloire d'Israël ton peuple» (Lc 2,30-32). Ce n'est pas seulement l'œuvre de Jésus que cet oracle annonce, mais également le témoignage de l'Église «jusqu'aux extrémités de la terre»⁽⁶⁾. C'est uniquement à la fin du livre des Actes que le lecteur pourra constater, avec Paul, l'accomplissement des paroles prophétiques de Siméon: «C'est aux païens qu'a été envoyé ce salut de Dieu» (Ac 28,28). Les récits de l'enfance ne font donc pas partie du récit du ministère de Jésus, mais ils préparent les deux phases de l'événement salutaire: l'offrande du Fils de Dieu et la prédication de ses témoins.

* * *

Par analogie avec les ch. 3 à 24 de l'Évangile, il semble assez simple d'établir le plan des Actes des Apôtres. De même que la prédication de Jésus est précédée d'une ouverture, montrant comment Jésus a été «rempli de l'Esprit-Saint» (Lc 3,1 - 4,13), de même les Actes décrivent la venue de l'Esprit sur le groupe des Douze, préalablement reconstitué grâce à l'élection de Matthias (Ac 1,15 - 2, 4). Vient alors l'œuvre des témoins de Jésus, dont le programme est donné par le Ressuscité en Ac 1,8: «Vous serez mes témoins à

⁽⁵⁾ Voir l'excellent article de E. SAMAIN, «La notion de APXH dans l'œuvre lucanienne», dans F. NEIRYNCK [éd.], *L'Évangile de Luc. Problèmes littéraires et théologiques* (Gembloux 1976) 299-328.

⁽⁶⁾ Ce point est développé dans l'étude magistrale de J. DUPONT, «Le salut des Gentils et la signification théologique du Livre des Actes», *NTS* 6 (1959-1960) 132-155 (= *Études sur les Actes des Apôtres* [Paris 1967] 393-419).

Jérusalem, dans toute la Judée et la Samarie, et jusqu'aux extrémités de la terre». Ce programme correspond effectivement au déroulement des Actes. C'est d'abord à Jérusalem que Pierre et ses compagnons, puis Étienne, sont témoins de Jésus. Les disciples se dispersent ensuite «dans les contrées de la Judée et de la Samarie» (8,1), où la Parole est annoncée par Philippe et Pierre. Enfin nous voyons comment à Antioche (13,2) l'Esprit-Saint se réserve Barnabas et Saul pour une tâche nouvelle, dont nous apprenons un peu plus loin le contenu: «apporter le salut aux extrémités de la terre» (13,47).

L'œuvre de Luc se présente ainsi comme très unifiée:

Préface: L'auteur annonce son intention (Lc 1,1-4)

Prologue: La révélation prophétique du dessein de Dieu (Lc 1,5 - 2,52)

La mission de Jésus (Lc 3,1 - 24,53)

Ouverture: Jésus reçoit l'Esprit-Saint (3,1 - 4,13)

1 - La prédication en Galilée (4,14 - 9,50)

2 - Enseignements sur la route de Jérusalem (9,51 - 19,28)

3 - Les événements de Jérusalem (19,29 - 24,53)

Nouvelle préface: Le jour de l'Ascension (Ac 1,1-14)

La mission des témoins de Jésus (Ac 1,15 - 28,15)

Ouverture: Les Onze et Matthias reçoivent l'Esprit-Saint (1,15 - 2,4)

1 - Le témoignage à Jérusalem (2,5 - 8,1a)

2 - Le témoignage dans la périphérie (8,1b - 12,25)

3 - Le témoignage jusqu'aux extrémités de la terre (13,1 - 28,15)

Épilogue: Le dessein de Dieu est réalisé (Ac 28,16-31)(7).

Un résumé très concis des deux tomes de l'ouvrage est mis par Luc sur les lèvres de Jésus lors de l'apparition qui conclut le premier volume: «C'est comme il a été écrit: le Christ souffrira et ressuscitera des morts le troisième jour, et on prêchera en son nom la conversion et le pardon des péchés à toutes les nations, à commencer par Jérusalem» (Lc 24,46-47).

* * *

A notre connaissance, cette proposition très simple — et, semble-t-il, assez évidente — n'a pas encore été faite jusqu'ici. Il s'en faut d'ailleurs de beaucoup que l'accord se soit réalisé sur l'organisation du livre des Actes. J. Dupont, qui vient de faire le point sur la question(8), a lui-même beaucoup hésité: après avoir proposé une division en cinq parties(9), puis en deux(10), il adopte maintenant un plan en quatre étapes (2,1 - 8,1a; 8,1b - 15,35; 15,36 - 19,40; 20,1 - 28,31), le ch.1 étant une introduction. Les considérations qui amènent le grand spécialiste des Actes à ce nouveau choix sont fort intéressantes: il s'est rendu compte que les règles de composition de l'Antiquité invitaient les historiens à ne pas faire d'interruption brusque entre les diver-

(7) Sur la fonction de la finale des Actes (28,16-31) dans l'ensemble de l'œuvre lucanienne, voir J. DUPONT, «La conclusion des Actes et son rapport à l'ensemble de l'ouvrage de Luc», dans J. KREMER, [éd.], *Les Actes des Apôtres. Traditions, rédaction, théologie* (Gembloux-Leuven 1979) 359-404.

(8) DUPONT, «La question du plan des Actes», 220-222.

(9) Cf. L. CERFAUX et J. DUPONT, *Les Actes des Apôtres* (BJ; Paris 1953).

(10) Voir DUPONT, «La question du plan des Actes», 221.

ses parties du récit, mais au contraire à ménager entre elles d'habiles transitions, grâce au procédé de «l'entrelacement» («la finale d'un développement doit annoncer et amorcer l'étape suivante, et celle-ci doit commencer en revenant sur ce qui a déjà été raconté»⁽¹¹⁾); c'est ce qu'on observe précisément en Ac 8,1-4 et 15,36-16,5, et — moins nettement à vrai dire — au début du ch.20⁽¹²⁾. Ce seraient donc les grandes articulations du livre.

Nous ne mettons pas en doute que Luc ait effectivement mis en œuvre dans les Actes ce procédé de composition. Nous ne voyons pas pour autant que la division quadripartite s'impose.

Nous sommes pleinement d'accord avec J. Dupont pour mettre au début du ch.8, où la technique en question est manifestement employée, une articulation importante: «On se trouve sur le seuil d'une nouvelle partie du livre. Dans l'histoire qui nous est racontée, le martyr d'Étienne achève une période: celle de la mission chrétienne à Jérusalem. Désormais, il ne sera plus question d'activité évangélisatrice qu'en dehors de cette ville»⁽¹³⁾.

Par contre, nous ne pouvons le suivre dans son analyse du début du ch.13. Il estime qu'en cet endroit il n'y a pas d'indices que «Luc ait eu conscience de commencer quelque chose de vraiment nouveau»⁽¹⁴⁾. Il n'y voit pas appliquée suffisamment la règle de «l'entrelacement»: certes, il est bien question en 12,25, puis en 13,2, de Barnabas et de Saul, ainsi que de Jean-Marc en 12,25, puis en 13,5; mais, selon J. Dupont, «le fil est bien tenu»⁽¹⁵⁾. Pour notre part, nous nous permettons de souligner que, même si le lien reste discret, la règle de «l'entrelacement» est effectivement appliquée ici par l'auteur des Actes. Et, d'autre part, il est clair que jusqu'alors la communauté d'Antioche et le lecteur tournaient encore leurs regards vers l'Église mère de Jérusalem (Ac 11,22.29-30; 12,25); désormais au contraire toute l'attention va se porter vers les contrées païennes qui n'ont pas encore reçu la Parole: il serait tout de même étonnant que Luc n'ait pas eu conscience de cette nouveauté!

Qu'une nouvelle étape commence aussi en Ac 15,36-16,4, c'est l'évidence. Qu'une autre enfin s'amorce en 19,21, lorsque Paul forme «dans l'Esprit» le projet de se rendre à Rome, cela est encore très clair. Mais ces deux étapes, consacrées à l'extension du message dans un territoire de plus en plus vaste, forment corps avec le premier voyage missionnaire de Paul, celui au cours duquel «Dieu avait ouvert aux païens la porte de la foi» (Ac 14,27). Lorsque commence le second voyage, les Églises de la gentilité existent bel et bien, elles n'ont plus besoin que d'être «affermies» (15,41), de «devenir plus fortes dans la foi» et de «croître en nombre de jour en jour» (16,5). L'acti-

⁽¹¹⁾ *Ibidem*, 225.

⁽¹²⁾ Les explications de DUPONT (*ibidem*, 229-230) n'ont pas réussi à le convaincre pleinement lui-même qu'une nouvelle partie commence en Ac 20,1. Il écrit finalement: «Nous n'aurions pas d'objection majeure contre un plan qui arrêterait la troisième étape à 19,20 et ferait commencer la quatrième à 19,21» (*ibidem*, 231). On remarquera que l'Esprit intervient pour diriger la mission en 13,2, puis en 16,6, et enfin en 19,21.

⁽¹³⁾ *Ibidem*, 226.

⁽¹⁴⁾ *Ibidem*, 227.

⁽¹⁵⁾ *Ibidem*, 227.

tivité missionnaire de Paul, commencée en 13,1, consacrée par un changement de nom en 13,9, achevée en 28,31, forme un tout dans la pensée de Luc.

L'unité thématique des trois parties que nous mettons en évidence est indiscutable: jusqu'au ch.7, la mission se déroule à Jérusalem; du ch.8 au ch.12, elle s'étend dans les contrées avoisinantes, là où se sont dispersés les disciples après la mort d'Étienne (Ac 8,4; 9,31; 11,19); à partir du ch.13, c'est l'itinéraire de Paul qui est décrit. De plus, il semble bien que Luc ait voulu montrer la fécondité apostolique de la souffrance des témoins de Jésus: la mort d'Étienne provoque l'extension du message, et aussi la conversion de Saul le persécuteur; de même, avant de montrer comment le monde entier va recevoir la prédication évangélique, Luc nous raconte la décapitation de Jacques et l'emprisonnement de Pierre; enfin, le livre se termine sur la vision de Paul «prêt à mourir pour le nom du Seigneur Jésus» (Ac 21,13), «livré aux mains des païens» (21,11; 28,17), et sa Passion est le gage des succès futurs de l'évangélisation (28,28). De ce point de vue encore nous retrouvons nos trois parties.

* * *

Une objection cependant peut venir à l'esprit. En ce qui concerne l'équilibre des masses, la composition manque d'harmonie: la troisième partie comporte 16 chapitres, plus de la moitié du livre. Ceci peut s'expliquer par l'abondance de la documentation de Luc touchant aux voyages missionnaires de Paul, et particulièrement pour la «section-nous» qui commence au ch.20. Il reste que l'ouvrage pourrait sembler déséquilibré.

Luc paraît avoir voulu corriger ce défaut, en jalonnant son récit d'un certain nombre de points d'appui dont la quantité est équivalente pour chacune des parties de l'ouvrage.

Les fruits du discours de la Pentecôte sont résumés dans cette réflexion joyeuse: «Le Seigneur adjoignait chaque jour à la communauté ceux qui trouvaient le salut» (2,47); vient alors le premier témoignage de Pierre et de Jean devant un tribunal (3,1-4,22); entre celui-ci et la deuxième comparution des apôtres devant le Sanhédrin (5,17-41), l'auteur brosse un tableau de la vie de l'Église et de sa croissance, et il écrit: «Des multitudes de plus en plus nombreuses d'hommes et de femmes se ralliaient par la foi au Seigneur» (5,14); enfin, avant de présenter le témoignage d'Étienne (6,8-7,60), les Actes se réjouissent encore une fois de l'extension de l'Église: «La parole de Dieu croissait et le nombre des disciples augmentait considérablement à Jérusalem» (6,7).

Pour commencer sa deuxième partie, Luc nous montre comment la mort d'Étienne fut le point de départ de l'évangélisation d'un territoire plus vaste: «Tous (...) se dispersèrent dans les contrées de la Judée et de la Samarie (...) Ceux donc qui avaient été dispersés allèrent de lieu en lieu, annonçant la bonne nouvelle de la Parole» (8,1.4). Les deux fruits de la mort d'Étienne, le ministère de Philippe en Samarie et la conversion de Saul, sont ensuite racontés (8,5-9,30). L'auteur constate alors l'existence de nombreuses communautés nouvelles dans la périphérie: «L'Église, sur toute l'étendue de la Judée, de la Galilée et de la Samarie, vivait donc en paix, elle s'édifiait et

marchait dans la crainte du Seigneur et, grâce à l'appui de l'Esprit-Saint, elle s'accroissait» (9,31). La suite du récit est consacrée au ministère de Pierre en Judée et en Samarie (9,32-11,18). En 11,19, Luc rappelle «la tourmente survenue à propos d'Étienne» et en décrit un nouveau fruit, l'extension de l'Église à Antioche: «Le Seigneur leur prêtait main-forte, si bien que le nombre fut grand de ceux qui se tournèrent vers le Seigneur, en devenant croyants» (11,21). Une troisième section montre enfin comment l'Église d'Antioche vint en aide à l'Église de Jérusalem, pauvre et persécutée (11,27 - 12,25), et ce récit se termine par un refrain exprimant la croissance de l'Église: «La parole de Dieu, cependant, croissait et se multipliait» (12,24).

Après le premier voyage de Paul et l'approbation de ses méthodes d'apostolat par l'assemblée de Jérusalem (13,1-15,35), Luc va souligner de nouveau la croissance de l'Église, cette fois dans le monde païen: «Les églises devenaient plus fortes dans la foi et croissaient en nombre de jour en jour» (16,5). Ensuite, il évite d'interrompre son récit⁽¹⁶⁾ tout au long des quatre chapitres où il raconte l'évangélisation de la Macédoine, de l'Achaïe et de l'Asie (16,6-19,19); cette nouvelle étape est saluée par un dernier refrain de croissance: «Ainsi, par la force du Seigneur, la Parole croissait et gagnait en puissance» (19,20). Il n'y aura plus d'autres réflexions de ce type, entre le moment où l'Esprit suggère à Paul de se rendre à Rome (19,21) et le moment où il y parvient (28,14), malgré la longueur du récit.

Grâce à ces points d'appui, Luc a pu mettre en valeur trois témoignages devant le Sanhédrin dans les ch. 3 à 7, trois moments principaux de l'évangélisation de la périphérie dans les ch. 8 à 12, et trois étapes de la mission de Paul dans les ch. 13 à 28. C'est ainsi qu'il a su remédier au défaut d'équilibre que provoquait la diversité de ses matériaux.

* * *

L'unité de pensée des deux volumes adressés à Théophile a été maintes fois prouvée⁽¹⁷⁾. L'originalité de notre contribution est de souligner que cette unité s'exprime particulièrement dans la structure que Luc a imposée aux matériaux qu'il utilisait. Son schéma géographique met en évidence la place centrale de Jérusalem, ville sainte, lieu du pardon accordé dans le Christ et point de départ de son annonce à toutes les nations.

Séminaire de Saint-Sulpice
33, rue du Général-Leclerc
92130 Issy-les-Moulineaux France

Philippe ROLLAND

⁽¹⁶⁾ Luc évite même de faire une pause en Ac 18,22-23, entre le deuxième et le troisième voyage missionnaire de Paul, qu'il rassemble en une seule étape (cf. P.-H. MENOUD, «Le plan des Actes des Apôtres», *NTS* 1 (1954) 44-51 (= *Jésus-Christ et la Foi* [Neuchâtel-Paris 1975] 84-91).

⁽¹⁷⁾ Outre les articles déjà cités de DUPONT, «Le salut des Gentils», et de SAMAIN, «La notion de APXH», signalons plus particulièrement le beau travail de P.-H. MENOUD, «Jésus et ses témoins. Remarques sur l'unité de l'œuvre de Luc», dans *Jésus-Christ et la Foi*, 100-110.

Latin Mam(m)ona and the Semitic Languages: A False Trail and a Suggestion⁽¹⁾

It is not known whether the Semitic term which lies behind the Greek word μαμωνᾶ (Matt 6,24; Luke 16,9.11.13) is Hebrew or Aramaic, and its vocalization is uncertain. In the course of a discussion of these points J. A. Fitzmyer writes, "The English spelling 'mammon' (with two m's) is said to be derived from Latin usage (although the Vulgate has *mamona* in Luke 16:9 [see R. Weber, *Biblia sacra iuxta Vulgatam versionem*, Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1969, 2. 1640], where no variant spelling is given). However, in the *Compact Edition of the Oxford English Dictionary* (London/New York: Oxford University, 1971), 1. 1709, the Vulgate spelling is listed as *mam(m)ona*. The form with two m's would better reflect the Semitic spelling *mammōnā* (< *ma'môn*). But the English spelling is still problematic"⁽²⁾. The purpose of this note is both to comment on Fitzmyer's observations in order to clarify the significance of this information and to make a suggestion about the possible origin of the Latin spelling *mammona*.

While R. Weber's edition of the Vulgate consistently reads *mamonae* or *mamona* and records no variant with a doubled m, Stephanus and the Sixtine and Clementine Vulgates always print *mammonae* or *mammona*. Further, since Codex Lichfeldensis, which has been dated to the seventh or the eighth century, reads *mammone* at Matt 6,24, and the Hereford Gospels, which are assigned to the eighth or the ninth century, have *mammona* or *mammone* at Luke 16,9.11.13⁽³⁾, it is certain that such a spelling was known in England before the earliest reported occurrence of the name "Mammonas" in English in 1362⁽⁴⁾. There is therefore a strong case for believing that the doubled m in "mammon" was derived from Latin usage. The further question whether it is directly dependent on the Vulgate or whether it was mediated through a medieval Latin author need not be pursued here.

Although it is relevant to ask whether *mamona* or *mammona* is the more primitive, for reasons which will appear later it is sufficient to examine

⁽¹⁾ I am grateful to Dr. G. I. DAVIES for his kindness in reading and commenting on this note.

⁽²⁾ J. A. FITZMYER, *A Wandering Aramean. Collected Aramaic Essays* (Mishoul 1979) 24, n. 59. Cf. J. A. FITZMYER in J. DUPONT [et al.], *Jésus aux origines de la Christologie* (Leuven 1975) 90, n. 59, where his position is stated less fully.

⁽³⁾ L. J. HOPKIN-JAMES, *The Celtic Gospels* (London 1934) 18, 228.

⁽⁴⁾ *The Oxford English Dictionary*, Vol. VI section 2 (Oxford 1933) 98.

the manuscript evidence for *mammona*. The material collected by J. Wordsworth and H. J. White⁽⁵⁾ is of interest first because the earliest Vulgate witness to the spelling *mammonae/mammona*, which it reads in all four places, is Codex Foro-Julienensis, written in the sixth or the seventh century, and second because this spelling is not restricted to an individual text-type. It is found in one or more verses in authorities with an Italian (J), a Spanish (C, T), or an Irish text (D, L, Q, R), or which belong to Alcuin's recension (K, V). The data furnished by the Old Latin should also be taken into account. At Matt 6,24 *c f ff¹ g¹ h q* have *mammonae*⁽⁶⁾, which is attested in Augustine's *De Sermone Domini in Monte* 2.14.47⁽⁷⁾. Comparable fullness of citation for Luke 16,9.11.13 is not attainable, but the following examples have been noted in printed editions: v. 9, *mammona aur c l, mammonae r²*; v. 11, *mammona aur c ff² l*; v. 13, *mammonae aur b c l*⁽⁸⁾. Further testimony to *mammonae* at either Matt 6,24 or Luke 16,13 is supplied by Irenaeus⁽⁹⁾, and both Irenaeus⁽¹⁰⁾ and Augustine⁽¹¹⁾ have *mammona* at Luke 16,9. Thus the spelling *mammona* is an intrinsic part of the Latin tradition.

By contrast, at Matt 6,24 only Ω , 372 and a few other minuscules read $\mu\alpha\mu\omega\nu\tilde{\alpha}$ ⁽¹²⁾, which entered the Textus Receptus, and I have been unable to trace a similar variant for $\mu\alpha\mu\omega\nu\tilde{\alpha}$ / $\mu\alpha\mu\omega\nu\tilde{\alpha}$ in Luke 16,9.11.13. According to K. Aland, Ω should be assigned to the ninth century and 372 to the sixteenth century⁽¹³⁾. The reference to Luke 16,13 (or, conceivably, Matt 6,24) in 2 Clement 6,1 has $\mu\alpha\mu\omega\nu\tilde{\alpha}$, and, again, there seems to be no variant. Further support for $\mu\alpha\mu\omega\nu\tilde{\alpha}$ at Matt 6,24 may be adduced from the Gothic⁽¹⁴⁾, the Harclean Syriac and the Georgian⁽¹⁵⁾, and, arguably, the Old Latin and the Vulgate, which might also be called in aid at Luke 16,9.11.13. But even so the picture that emerges is markedly different from that presented by

(5) J. WORDSWORTH and H. J. WHITE, *Novum Testamentum Domini nostri Jesu Christi Latine secundum editionem Sancti Hieronymi*, Vol. I (Oxford 1889-98) 62, 422.

(6) S. C. E. LEGG, *Novum Testamentum Graece. Evangelium secundum Matthaeum* (Oxford 1940) *ad loc.* LEGG also includes *m*, but, leaving aside the question whether the Speculum contains an Old Latin text, according to J. BELSHEIM, *Fragmenta Novi Testamenti... ex libro qui vocatur Speculum* (Christiania 1899), Matt 6,24 is not quoted in it.

(7) CChL 35, 138. But see also n. 21 below.

(8) J. BELSHEIM, *Codex Aureus* (Christiania 1878) 261f.; IDEM, *Codex Veronensis* (Prague 1904) 107; IDEM, *Codex Colbertinus Parisiensis* (Christiania 1888) 93; IDEM, *Codex f² Corbeiensis* (Christiania 1887) 87; H. J. VOGELS, *Codex Regidigeranus* (Rome 1913) 223; and H. C. HOSKIER, *The Text of Codex Usseianus* 2 (London 1919) 144.

(9) *Adversus Haereses* 3.8.1 (HARVEY 2, 27).

(10) *Adversus Haereses* 4.46.3 (HARVEY 2, 251).

(11) *Sermo* 113 (PL 38, col. 648).

(12) S. C. E. LEGG, *loc. cit.*

(13) K. ALAND, *Kurzgefasste Liste der Griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments* (Berlin 1963) 41, 81.

(14) G. W. S. FRIEDRICHSEN, *The Gothic Version of the Gospels. A Study of its Style and Textual History* (London 1926) 36. Cf. also the marginal gloss *mammonim* in Codex Argenteus at Luke 16,13 (*ibid.*, 219).

(15) S. C. E. LEGG, *loc. cit.*

the Latin versions, and the consensus that it is wholly unlikely that $\mu\alpha\mu\omega\nu\tilde{\alpha}$ represents the original text is sound.

Since it is reasonable to suppose that $\mu\alpha\mu\omega\nu\tilde{\alpha}$ is a correct transliteration of the underlying Semitic term, the Latin form *mammona* cannot indicate that this word was spelt with a doubled m, and any etymology which requires this is excluded. F. Hauck, presumably following E. Nestle⁽¹⁶⁾, suggests that Latin *mammona* may perhaps be "Angleichung an mamma, annona uä"⁽¹⁷⁾, but this is not the only possibility, for knowledge of a Semitic cognate which had a doubled m could have influenced the Old Latin. In the early church appeal was made to various Semitic languages to clarify the meaning of *mam(m)ona*. Thus Irenaeus, who, as W. W. Harvey says, took *mammonas* to be Aramaic "but not in strict propriety Hebrew"⁽¹⁸⁾, wrote, *Mammonas autem est secundum Judaicam loquelam, qua et Samaritae utuntur, cupidus... Secundum autem Hebraicam, adjunctive dicitur Mamuel, et significat gulosum... Secundum utraque igitur quae significantur, non possumus Deo servire, et Mammonae*⁽¹⁹⁾. Jerome too thought that the term was Aramaic: *mammona sermone syriaco divitiae nuncupantur*⁽²⁰⁾. But Augustine, drawing on the Punic which was current in North Africa in his day, stated, *Mammona apud Hebraeos divitiae appellari dicuntur. Congruit et Punicum nomen; nam lucrum Punice mammon dicitur*⁽²¹⁾. In all probability he

⁽¹⁶⁾ E. NESTLE, in *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, ed. T. K. CHEYNE and J. S. BLACK, Vol. III (London 1902) col. 2913.

⁽¹⁷⁾ F. HAUCK, *TWNT*, Vol. IV, 390, n. 1, where he also says, "Die griech u syr Hdschr bevorzugen durchaus die Schreibung mit einem μ , was für die Ableitung bedeutungsvoll ist". See further *ibid.*, n. 2, for a discussion of the etymology, and cf. NESTLE, *loc. cit.* This anticipation of the argument of part of the present note was seen only after the first draft had been written. To the material collected in the standard works should now be added *mmnhy*, which appears in line 4 of an Aramaic text published by A. CAQUOT ("Une inscription araméenne d'époque assyrienne", in *Hommages à André Dupont-Sommer* [Paris 1971] 9-16). The initial *mem* is damaged, but the reading seems secure. CAQUOT takes the word to be in the plural with the third person singular suffix, and translates "ses profits". The text cannot be dated precisely, but it comes from "un territoire araméophone sous domination assyrienne" and the orthography has affinities with forms which belong to the seventh century B.C.

⁽¹⁸⁾ HARVEY 2, 27, n. 3.

⁽¹⁹⁾ *Adversus Haereses* 3.8.1 (HARVEY 2, 27f.).

⁽²⁰⁾ *Commentariorum in Matheum Libri IV*, at Matt 6,24 (CChL 77, 39). Cf. the similar statements in Jerome, *Epistola* 22. 31 (PL 22, col. 417), and especially in *Epistola* 121.6 (PL 22, col. 1019), where he denies that *mamona* is Hebrew. See J. BARR, "St. Jerome's Appreciation of Hebrew", *BJRL* 49 (1966-67) 286-288, for Jerome's acquaintance with "the vocabulary of some kind of Aramaic".

⁽²¹⁾ *De Sermone Domini in Monte* 2. 14. 47 (see n. 7 above). A. MUTZENBECHER's *apparatus criticus* includes the entry "mam(m)on: -mone L -mona W". Cf. also *Sermo* 113. 2 (see n. 11 above), and *De Lectione Evangelii* 2, lines 248f., in C. LAMBOT, "Nouveaux Sermons de S. Augustin, I-III, 'De Lectione Evangelii'", *RBén* 49 (1937) 265 = PL Supplement 2, col. 765: *Mamona divitiae dicuntur nomine hebraeo, unde et punice mammon lucrum dicitur*. The theory advanced in this paragraph can succeed only if, as may easily be the case, the manuscript in which this sermon is preserved spells *mamon* wrongly.

knew two different spellings, and it is clear that he believed that *mammona* and *mammon* were not synonyms. Presumably Augustine learnt from Christian tradition that *mammona* denoted *divitiae*, while *mammon* was the pronunciation of a word which signified *lucrum* in the vernacular with which some at least of his flock would have been familiar⁽²²⁾. Whether the Old Latin was translated in North Africa or elsewhere, the version has strong links with this area⁽²³⁾. Although *mammona* is not a reading characteristic of manuscripts which have an African text, the doubled m in Punic *mammon* could have caused either a translator or a later scribe to write *mammona* instead of *mamona*.

The conclusions of this note may be summarised as follows. Fitzmyer's doubts about the spelling *mammona* are without foundation, for it is amply attested in the Old Latin and the Vulgate, and so a straightforward explanation for the English spelling "mammon" is readily available. But, because the Greek New Testament reads μαμωνᾶ, this Latin evidence is of no assistance for the recovery of the underlying Semitic term. Further, the possibility that the spelling *mammona* entered the Old Latin under the influence of Punic *mammon* deserves consideration.

Department of Biblical Studies,
University College of North Wales,
Bangor, Gwynedd, U.K.

B. A. MASTIN

⁽²²⁾ For present purposes the precise sense of *punicus* in Augustine is immaterial; cf. on this, e.g., C. COURTOIS, "Saint Augustin et le problème de la survivance du Punique", *Revue Africaine* 94 (1950) 259-282, reprinted in *CahTun* 23, Nos. 89-90 (1975) 273-294, and the replies by CH. SAUMAGNE, "La survivance du Punique en Afrique aux V^e et VI^e siècles après J.-C.", *Karth* 4 (1953) 169-178 and J. LECERF, "Notule sur saint Augustin et les survivances Puniques", in *Augustinus Magister* Vol. I (Paris n.d.) 31-33. It is sufficient that Augustine knew two similar words which could have been confused.

⁽²³⁾ B. M. METZGER, *The Early Versions of the New Testament* (Oxford 1977) 288-289, 326-327.

Discusión crítica en Mt 17,4

Es conocida la narración de la Transfiguración del Señor que reproducen los tres sinópticos. Y como hay alguna variante digna de atención, parece interesante considerar la posible razón de su aceptación por parte de los críticos. Me refiero a la lectura ποιησω / ποιησωμεν que se puede discutir tanto en Mt como en los lugares paralelos. El versículo de Mt 17,4 es el siguiente: ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Πέτρος εἶπεν τῷ Ἰησοῦ· κύριε, καλὸν ἐστὶν ἡμᾶς ὥδε εἶναι· εἰ θέλεις, ποιήσω ὥδε τρεῖς σκηνάς, σοὶ μίαν καὶ Μωϋσεὶ μίαν καὶ Ἠλίᾳ μίαν. Antes de proceder a la discusión, disponemos la perícopa de forma que se pueda apreciar la correlación de miembros en los tres paralelos.

Mt 17,4	Mc 9,5
κύριε,	ῥαββί,
καλὸν ἐστὶν ἡμᾶς ὥδε εἶναι·	καλὸν ἐστὶν ἡμᾶς ὥδε εἶναι,
εἰ θέλεις,	
ποιήσω ὥδε τρεῖς σκηνάς	καὶ ποιήσωμεν τρεῖς σκῆνας

Lc 9,33

ἐπιστάτα,
καλὸν ἐστὶν ἡμᾶς ὥδε εἶναι,
καὶ ποιήσωμεν σκηνάς τρεῖς

Añadimos ahora la atestación en favor de ποιησω y ποιησωμεν en cada uno de los tres evangelistas, y además tenemos en cuenta la anteposición de (ει) θελεις.

Mt

ποιησωμεν var. general
ποιησομεν Φ f1 pc
ποιησω κ B C* 700* pc b ff¹ ff² vg^{mss}
pr ει θελεις var. general
pr θελεις W Θ f1 33 sa^{mss} bo

Mc

ποιησωμεν var. general
ποιησομεν V 51 71 74 78 82 86* 87 89 90 700 1342
ποιησω D W Θ 1071 b ff² i
pr ει θελης 700 (c) f q
pr θελεις W (1071)
pr ει θελεις > και 28 a
pr θελεις > και D Θ f13 543 565 b ff²i

Lc

ποιησωμεν var. general
 θελεις, ποιησω ωδε D* (bo)

Es suficientemente claro que tanto en Mc como en Lc no sólo hay concordancia de narración, sino completa identidad de expresión. En ambos casos se usan las mismas palabras, fuera de los títulos empleados para dirigirse al Señor (la inversión *τρεις σκηνας* no interesa a nuestro propósito, ya que en realidad se trata de las mismas palabras). Por consiguiente aquí no conviene hablar de armonización, pues se verifica una conformidad total que excluye un empeño de acomodación textual. Todos los críticos tanto en Mc como en Lc⁽¹⁾ leen *ποιησωμεν*.

Sin embargo, ¿por qué en Mt la casi totalidad de los críticos⁽²⁾ prefiere *ποιησω* a *ποιησωμεν*? Sencillamente, porque en Mt no se comprueba la misma identidad narrativa. Se cambia la indecisión o timidez expresada por el aoristo de subjuntivo en un período condicional (con la adición de una prótasis *ει θελεις*), en el que *ποιέω* pasa a formar parte de la apódosis. Tenemos, pues, un período condicional real, con los verbos en presente y futuro de indicativo. El aoristo de subjuntivo sería insólito. Además, en el caso concreto, la introducción del verbo *θέλω* parece también exigir cambio de persona en el verbo de la apódosis.

Recordemos, en primer lugar, que la atestación de *ει θελεις* es más que suficiente para que la variante sea aceptada. De hecho la tienen todos los críticos⁽³⁾.

A pesar de este consenso, ¿pro qué — insistimos — no admitir en Mt *ποιησωμεν*? En favor de esta forma verbal pueden aducirse muchos manuscritos que testimonian *ει θελεις* con otros de la variante *θελεις*. Si la aceptación vale para *ει θελεις*⁽⁴⁾, ¿por qué no para *ποιησωμεν*⁽⁵⁾?

(1) ALAND — BLACK — MARTINI — METZGER — WIKGREN³, BOVER — O'CALLAGHAN, LAGRANGE, LEGG, MERK⁹, NESTLE — ALAND²⁶, TASKER, TISCHENDORF⁸, VOGELS³, VON SODEN, WEISS², WESTCOTT — HORT, *Syn*ALAND⁷, *Syn*HUCK — GREEVEN¹³. Obviamente en Lc debe prescindirse de LEGG.

(2) Todos — incluso LEGG — los de la nota anterior, menos VOGELS³.

(3) Cf. n. 1.

(4) Puede también preguntarse por qué (*ει*) *θελεις* en Mc y Lc no merecen la atención de los críticos. En Mc — según LEGG, del cual se han tomado las variantes y su correspondiente atestación — hay cuatro posibles lecturas: *θελεις* > *και*, *ει θελεις* > *και*, *θελεις* y *ει θελεις*. La mejor testimoniada *θελεις* > *και* no parece pueda aceptarse — habiendo peligro de armonización — contra una numerosa e importante corriente textual. Las otras variantes (incluida *ει θελεις*) carecen de documentación atendible. En NESTLE-ALAND²⁶ ni siquiera se considerarían estas lecciones. En Lc la atestación en favor de la adición *θελεις* es también muy escasa. Está registrada en NESTLE-ALAND²⁶, pero con el signo *p*) que indica riesgo de contaminación por paralelos.

(5) Ni para la aceptación de esta variante, parece pueda arguirse de que hay casos en que *θέλω* en singular se construye con un subjuntivo en plural — o al revés —, lo cual aparentemente permitiría la aceptación de la lectura *θελεις*, *ποιησωμεν*. Recuérdese Mt 13,28 (*θέλεις συλλέξωμεν*) o v. gr., 26,17 (*θέλεις ετοιμάσωμεν*). Estos casos están considerados en BLASS-DEBRUNNER¹⁴ 366,3, pero se incluyen bajo el epígrafe de «Konj. (oder Fut.) in *Fragen* [énfasis mía] des

Con miras a una adecuada respuesta, hay que recurrir a la escena concreta de la narración mateana. Dado el contexto, parece preferible la forma singular: Pedro es el que habla y, si el Señor lo permite, Pedro *hará*. No se trata aquí de una tímida deliberación colectiva expresada en subjuntivo. Es una oración real que indica el carácter decidido y resuelto de Pedro. Ni parece deba escogerse la «lectio impolitor» con mezcla de singular y plural más promiscuidad de realidad e indecisión. Evidentemente que ésta sería una lectura más difícil, pero menos en consonancia con los elementos constitutivos de la precisa narración. En crítica racional no puede decidir muchas veces un principio solo. Lo que en última instancia puede dar la solución es la congruencia con el estilo del hagiógrafo y la certera evaluación de los elementos textuales, aquí narrativos⁽⁶⁾.

Por otra parte, si se omite ει θελεις, son todavía muchos los manuscritos que presentan ποιησωμεν (o -ομεν: ¿forma verbal en realidad diferente o sólo cambio fonético?). Pero en este caso, se verificaría identidad narrativa también en Mt, y consiguientemente el singular ποιησω sería tan rechazable como en Mc y Lc. Al no darse, pues, esta identidad en Mt, parece más justificable la variante singular, y la plural se puede considerar en todo caso como una armonización, al menos material, en un determinado sector de la transmisión textual.

Pontificio Instituto Bíblico
Via della Pilotta, 25
00187 Roma

José O'CALLAGHAN

Zweifels und der Überlegung». Ahora bien, los ejemplos citados no dicen relación a un período condicional. Pero si se aceptaran para explicar Mt 17,4, entonces la frase de Mt dejaría de ser afirmativa y se convertiría en *interrogativa*. Pedro preguntaría a Jesús: ¿Quieres que hagamos tres tiendas? Esta pregunta sería mucho menos aceptable, pues se opondría más abiertamente a la actitud característica de Pedro, como se analiza a continuación.

⁽⁶⁾ Cf. BOVER - O'CALLAGHAN, p. XLVIII.

Le naziréat et la Passion (Mc 14,25a; 15,23)

1. Le refus du vin mêlé avec la myrrhe avant la crucifixion (Mc 15,23) est couramment expliqué par la volonté de souffrir en pleine conscience, la myrrhe rendant les victimes inconscientes ou étourdies⁽¹⁾. Et cependant, les scènes de Gethsémani montrent que Jésus ne cherchait pas la souffrance. Ensuite, selon tous les Évangiles, c'est sa mort qui constitue un événement décisif, révélateur et salvifique; le motif de la souffrance est présent dans la théologie paulinienne, mais là aussi il reste soumis aux grands thèmes de la condition humaine et de la mort. L'interprétation citée semble résulter plutôt de la piété plus tardive, préoccupée par les souffrances physiques de Jésus, et des considérations dogmatiques portant sur sa conscience et sa volonté.

2. En recherchant des raisons pour le refus du vin, on peut l'associer avec l'annonce formelle de ne plus boire «du produit de la vigne» prononcée pendant la Cène. Selon Mc 14,25 Jésus dit: «En vérité, je vous le dis, je ne boirai plus du produit de la vigne — jusqu'au jour où je le boirai nouveau dans le Royaume de Dieu». La phrase commence solennellement par ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι... suivi par une négation renforcée: οὐκ ἐστὶ οὐ μὴ πῖω...⁽²⁾. L'usage de ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν suivi d'une phrase à la première personne est presque unique dans les Évangiles (seulement Mt 8,10; 25,12); l'annonce ainsi commencée semble avoir un sens spécial.

La deuxième moitié du verset suggère que la prévision est eschatologique (interprétation dominante). Cela ne se rapporte qu'au vin nouveau dans la perspective générale de l'avenir, tandis que l'annonce de ne plus boire de vin paraît immédiate et concrète. Une allusion à la mort prochaine se cache aussi surtout dans la deuxième partie du verset, parce que le seul fait de s'abstenir de vin ne la suggère pas suffisamment.

Les mots ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν introduisent d'habitude une vérité générale ou une prophétie du genre eschatologique. Là où ils se rapportent aux événements concrets, leur réalisation est certaine. Marc nous fournit deux exemples très proches de notre texte: la trahison de Judas et le reniement de Pierre

(1) Cf. e.g. la présentation de R. PESCH, *Das Markusevangelium* (HTKNT II.2; Freiburg-Basel-Wien 1977) 478-479; il tient néanmoins que le texte ne fournit aucune explication décisive.

(2) Οὐκ ἐστὶ manque dans κ CLW etc. (influence de Mt? une modification stylistique?); οὐ μὴ προσθῶ πῖν — D etc. (un sémitisme primitif?). Cf. B. M. METZGER, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (London-New York 1975) 113-114.

(Mc 14,18.30). L'accomplissement de ces prévisions est présenté d'une manière explicite. On peut donc attendre une confirmation semblable de Mc 14,25a.

En effet, Mc 15,23 dit: «Et ils lui donnaient du vin avec la myrrhe, *mais il n'en prit pas*». Selon Mc 15,36, quelqu'un lui donnait à boire du vinaigre, un produit de la vigne aussi, mais il n'est ni exclu, ni confirmé que Jésus en ait pris. Il nous faut nous appuyer sur le seul Mc 15,23.

L'Évangile nous donne deux informations qui se complètent réciproquement, sans tout de même les commenter; la terminologie de Mc 15,23 n'a aucun point commun avec Mc 14,25 (il en est autrement dans les cas de Judas et de Pierre). Apparemment, la coïncidence de ces deux détails ne joue aucun rôle majeur dans la théologie de Marc. Par conséquent, si l'on trouve un lien logique entre eux, il est tout à fait possible que ce lien reflète la pensée de Jésus.

3. Dans Mc 14,25a Jésus annonce de ne plus boire du produit (fruit) de la vigne: οὐ μὴ πῖω ἐκ τοῦ γενήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου. Dans Is 32,12 (LXX) on trouve ἀμπέλου γενήματος, Ha 3,17: γενήματα ἐν ταῖς ἀμπέλοις; il s'agit des raisins et non d'une boisson. Pareillement Jg 13,14 sur Samson: ὅσα ἐκπορεύεται ἐξ ἀμπέλου (A).

L'interdiction du vin est mentionnée dans Nb 6,4; Jg 13,7.14; implicitement en Am 2,12. Autres textes: Jer 35,6.14: les coutumes des Rékabites; Lc 1,15: Jean-Baptiste comme un nazir (une citation libre de Jg 13,7). Dans Ac 21,17-27, un vœu temporaire de Paul, rien n'est dit sur le vin.

Nb 6,3s qui se rapporte à l'ensemble des produits de la vigne interdits aux nazirs contient les mots suivants: οὐ πίεται... οὐ φάγεται... ὅσα γίνονται ἐξ ἀμπέλου, οἶνον... Dans ce texte, le plus complet sur le naziréat, les parallèles avec Mc 14,25a sont visibles: πίνω; ἐκ+ ἀμπέλος — seulement ici à propos du vin; ὅσα γίνεται et γενήματα liés étymologiquement et phonétiquement signifient presque la même chose. Une allusion au naziréat chez Marc est nette. On peut donc penser que Mc 14,25 contient un *vœu de naziréat*, tenu ensuite au prix de la souffrance.

Le naziréat obligeait encore à ne pas couper la chevelure et à ne pas toucher les impuretés. La première condition semble remplie, la deuxième serait insignifiante à la lumière de l'enseignement de Jésus.

4. Dans les autres Évangiles les traces du naziréat sont plus ou moins effacées. Mt 26,29 omet ἀμήν et οὐκέτι, affaiblissant ainsi l'annonce, bien qu'il la précise par ἀπ' ἄρτι. Dans la deuxième partie du verset apparaît «avec vous», de sorte que l'attention se déplace de la situation personnelle de Jésus à sa rencontre future avec les disciples. Lc 22,14-18 associe le logion avec une annonce de ne plus manger la Pâque (absente chez Marc); ἀμήν, οὐκέτι, et «nouveau» manquent. Pourtant, tous les deux ont conservé l'expression-clé «le fruit de la vigne», apparemment la plus frappante.

Selon Mt 27,34 Jésus goûta du vin mêlé de fiel, mais il n'en voulut pas boire. Luc omet cette phrase. Quant au vinaigre, Matthieu et Luc ne précisent pas, si Jésus en prit; par contre, Jean l'affirme.

5. Pour éclairer le naziréat de Jésus il faut se rapporter à son interprétation théologique donnée par Nb 6,2-8: le nazir est *voué et consacré* — à Yahvé, à Dieu; tel est, en effet, la signification de la racine *nzr*. Sa sainteté consiste dans une séparation et dans la consécration à Dieu. En plus, Nb 6,5.8.11s expriment l'idée de la sainteté du nazir⁽³⁾ à l'aide de la racine *qdš*.

Selon une tradition plus ancienne, Dieu choisissait les nazirs (Am 2,11) pour la vie (Samson, Samuel — et Jean-Baptiste). LXX rend la racine *nzr* par εὐχή (vœu), ἀγνεία (pureté) et ses dérivés qui suggèrent déjà un sens plus rituel du naziréat (cf. Ac 21,17-27) — mais aussi par ἅγιος etc.: Am 2,11 s; Jg 13,5(A).7(B): *nʿzir ʾēlōhīm* — ἅγιος Θεοῦ (cf. Mc 1,24; Lc 4,34; Jn 6,69).

Le naziréat de Jésus signifie qu'à partir de la Cène il s'est séparé de la vie ordinaire pour se tourner entièrement vers Dieu. Annonçant son vœu et refusant le vin (un acte symbolique et significatif), Jésus se révèle comme le saint de Dieu et comme tel entre dans sa Passion.

59, rue Boissière
75116 Paris

Michał WOJCIECHOWSKI

⁽³⁾ L'association entre le naziréat et la sainteté peut-elle expliquer aussi le nom de Ναζωραῖος donné à Jésus — «saint» dans le sens actuel de ce mot?

The Metaphor in Prov 11,30

pēri šaddīq 'ēš ḥayyīm
wēlōqēah nēpāšōt ḥākām
 The fruit of the just is of a tree of life,
 And the wise gathers life/lives.

The second half of Prov 11,30 is difficult. Two solutions are commonly proposed depending on how the phrase *lōqēah nēpāšōt* is understood. If the phrase is understood to mean the same as *lāqah nepeš*, "takes life, kills", then *ḥākām* is emended to *ḥāmās* and v.30b is translated: "but violence takes lives" (1).

The alternative to emendation is to assign a meaning to *lōqēah nēpāšōt* compatible with *ḥākām*. Since *lāqah* sometimes means "capture, seize" and is used metaphorically of the foreign woman's wiles in Prov 6,25, the meaning "wins, attracts, captivates" is usually suggested (2). Dahood prefers "attains" on the basis of UT, 2 *Aqht*: VI: 35-36 (3). The hero Aqhat, having been offered eternal life, asks skeptically what future a human being may hope to "attain" (*yqh*). According to Dahood, *nēpāšōt* is a plural of excellence, "eternal life", and parallels *ḥayyīm* in much the same way 'al *māwet*, "immortality", parallels it in Prov 12,28; hence, "And the wise man attains eternal life".

These attempts to save the MT reading are able to assign a meaning to *lōqēah nēpāšōt* that is to some extent grounded in OT or cognate usage. Yet it is doubtful whether one would be inclined to prefer such a meaning to the meaning "takes lives", close as the latter is to the well-documented *lāqah nepeš*, except in order to avoid emending the text. Dahood, it is true, tries to establish a link with the first half of the verse by insisting on the *ḥayyīm-nēpāšōt* parallel and so to provide a reason in the context for the particular

(1) Commentators adopting this emendation include C. H. TOY, *The Book of Proverbs* (ICC 16; New York 1899); W. O. E. OESTERLEY, *The Book of Proverbs* (London 1929); H. RENARD, "Le Livre des Proverbes", *Bible Pirot-Clamer*, vol. 6, pp. 28-187 (Paris 1946); H. DUESBERG, *Le Livre des Proverbes* (Paris 1957); B. GEMSER, *Sprüche Salomos* (HAT 16; Tübingen 1963); R. B. Y. SCOTT, *Proverbs, Ecclesiastes* (Garden City, N.Y. 1965); W. MCKANE, *Proverbs: A New Approach* (Philadelphia 1970); R. N. WHYBRAY, *The Book of Proverbs* (London 1972).

(2) Franz DELITZSCH, *Das salomonische Spruchbuch* (Leipzig 1873); H. RINGGREN, *Sprüche* (ATD 16; Göttingen 1967); A. BARUCQ, *Le Livre des Proverbes* (Paris 1964).

(3) M. J. DAHOOD, *Proverbs and Northwest Semitic Philology* (Rome 1963) 24-26.

turn he gives v.30b. But he overlooks, as does everyone else so far as I know, the one really significant aspect of v.30a for the interpretation of v.30b, the metaphor it contains. Verse 30a speaks of "the fruit of the just" and of "a tree of life", and in connection with "fruit" the verb *lāqah* takes on a specific sense, "pick, gather". In Gen 40,9-11 Pharaoh's chief butler tells Joseph his dream of a vine laden with clusters of grapes which he picked and pressed into Pharaoh's cup. The verb for "pick" is *lāqah*. Similarly when the spies are instructed to gather some of the fruit of the land in Num 13,20 and Deut 1,25, the verb for "gather" is *lāqah*. Above all, in Gen 3,6 and 3,22 the verb used of picking fruit from the tree of knowledge and the tree of life respectively is again *lāqah*. The connection between *lāqah* and the fruit of the tree of life in this last text strongly suggests that *lōqēah nēpāšōt* at the beginning of v.30b should be understood in the light of the metaphor in the first half of the verse: "The fruit of the just is of a tree of life" (4).

What does it mean to say that the wise gathers *nēpāšōt* like fruit? First it must be determined whether *nēpāšōt* has an abstract or a concrete meaning, "life" or "lives". To argue in favor of abstract "life" it is not necessary to adopt Dahood's plural of excellence, "eternal life". The plural of excellence is only one among a number of abstract plurals in Hebrew. The abstract plural *hayyīm*, for example, is, according to GKC 124 d, "the abstract idea of the qualities of a living being". Plural *nēpāšōt*, however, does not appear to have the abstract meaning "life" elsewhere in the OT. It is always "lives". But the parallelism between *hayyīm* and *nēpāšōt* in Prov 11,30 is unique in the OT, so far as I have been able to determine. If *lōqēah nēpāšōt* continues the metaphor of v.30a, then just as *hayyīm* qualifies the type of fruit produced in v.30a, so *nēpāšōt* qualifies the type of fruit picked in v.30b. This unique parallelism permits us to entertain the possibility that *nēpāšōt* bears a meaning unique to it in the OT and synonymous with the meaning of its parallel *hayyīm*, i.e., "life". "The wise gathers life" would then neatly balance "the fruit of the just is of a tree of life" and would presumably refer to the reward the wise may hope to obtain.

If the plural has its normal meaning, individual "lives", then it would refer, not to the reward of the wise directly, but to the activity, the teaching, one would suppose, of the wise on behalf of others. The image of gathering fruit applied to such activity appears to be altogether unique in the OT. The teaching of the wise is described as a "fountain of life" in Prov 13,14. Closer to the agricultural image in 11,30b, the wise are at one point said to "scatter knowledge" (Prov 15,7). But the metaphor of gathering fruit, either implied in that of eating fruit (Prov 1,31; 12,14; 13,2; 18,20-21; 27,18) or included more generally in that of reaping (Prov 22,8; Job 4,8; Hos 8,7;

(4) V.30a contains an ellipsis: "The fruit of the just is (fruit) of a tree of life"; cf. Cant 1,15, "Your eyes are doves, i.e., the eyes of doves" (GK 141d), and Ps 72,16 with *k*, "May its fruit be like Lebanon, i.e. like the fruit of Lebanon". The emendation of *šaddiq* to *šēdāqā*, often suggested on the basis of the LXX, is unnecessary if parallel *hākām* is retained.

10,12,13), seems to be reserved for the description of the reward to be expected as a result of one's activity. By contrast such a metaphor is known to the NT. Paul tells the Romans he had wanted to visit them "in order that I might gather some fruit among you as among the rest of the Gentiles" (Rom 1,13), and Jesus tells his disciples that "he who reaps receives wages and gathers fruit for eternal life" (John 4,36). Such texts are useful in illustrating how such a metaphor may be used of the activity of preaching or teaching, but one must be careful not to interpret Prov 11,30 from their perspective alone. Perhaps the interpretation of the metaphor most suitable to the OT context is that it refers to the ability of the wise to save lives from death by their teaching. According to Prov 13,14 "the teaching of the wise is a fountain of life that one may avoid the snares of death". If to "gather lives" is meant to stress the power of wisdom to save from death, this would be consistent with the use of *nēpāšôt* the only other two times the word occurs in *Proverbs*. In Prov 1,18 the wicked are represented as unwittingly waiting in ambush for their own "lives", while the truthful witness in Prov 14,25 is one who "saves lives", *maššil nēpāšôt*. The phrase *lōqēah nēpāšôt* in fact comes close to being an equivalent for *maššil nēpāšôt* as the use of *lāqah* in Ps 49,16 demonstrates: "He will redeem my life (*napšī*) from the power of Sheol for he will save me (*yiqqāhēnī*)". Thus to gather lives like fruit would at the same time be to pluck them from the power of death.

But if it is true that gathering lives is saving lives, a very curious feature of v.30b emerges. Its meaning is the exact opposite of that conveyed by comparison of the phrase *lōqēah nēpāšôt* with the phrase *lāqah nepēš*, "takes life". This may be an accidental irony, but respect for the authors of the wise sayings in *Proverbs* suggests the irony is anything but accidental. The resemblance of the two phrases is too close. When this resemblance suggests the meaning "takes lives" for *lōqēah nēpāšôt*, however, the mind rejects it as inapplicable to the wise, as it has been rejected throughout the history of the interpretation of the verse. By suggesting that the irony is intentional, what is being said is that rejection of the meaning "takes lives" is programmed into the saying itself. The saying thereby not only affirms the connection of the wise with life, but obliges the mind in its movement to understand the meaning to deny the connection of the wise with death.

When the question of the meaning of "the wise gathers *nēpāšôt* (like fruit)" was raised, it was said that what must first be determined is whether *nēpāšôt* has an abstract or a concrete meaning. Now it must be asked whether such a determination is either possible or desirable. The normal meaning would dictate "lives", but the balance between *ḥayyim* and *nēpāšôt* as qualifiers of the fruit to be obtained would dictate "life". There is a distinct advantage in maintaining the double meaning. By it the saying combines the activity of the wise and the reward for that activity in a single image in much the same way that the words of John's Gospel do in the text quoted above.

I have argued that the metaphor in Prov 11,30a provides the clue to the meaning of the difficult phrase *lōqēah nēpāšôt* in the second half of the verse. Used elsewhere in the OT of fruit and even of the fruit of the tree of life

where it means “pick, gather”, the verb *lāqaḥ* is best understood as continuing the metaphor of v.30a by means of the image of gathering fruit. The fruit gathered is metaphorically *nēpāšôt*, “life” or “lives”. The double meaning should be retained, for then both the activity and the reward of the wise would be described. The meaning “takes lives”, suggested by the similarity between *lōqēah nēpāšôt* and the phrase *lāqaḥ nepeš*, is intended to be recognized and then rejected when its incompatibility with *ḥakam* is seen. This permits the saying both to affirm the connection of the wise with life and deny their connection with death, but it has led numerous commentators to mistake the deliberate contradiction for a corruption of the text and by correction to thin its density.

University of St. Michael's College
81 St. Mary St.
Toronto, Ontario M5S 1J4
Canada

William H. IRWIN

‘*bṭ*’ in Joel 2,7

Joel 2,7 contains the phrase *wəlo’ yəabbəṭūn ‘orhôtām* (וְלֹא יַעֲבֹטֻן אֹרְחוֹתָם). The verb ‘*bṭ*’ appears elsewhere in biblical Hebrew only in Deuteronomy (15,6.8; 24,10) where it has the meaning ‘to pledge’. The difficulty in Joel is that this meaning would make no sense, since one cannot ‘pledge’ paths. The Septuagint represents the verb as ἐκκλίνωσιν ‘decline, fall away’, and is followed by both Peshitta (*nstwn*) and Vulgate (*declinabunt*). These readings prompted such emendations as *yattūn* ‘go aside’, *ya’awwūn* ‘err’ and *y’aw-wəṭūn* ‘make crooked’⁽¹⁾. But none of these is convincing, since they do not contain the letter *b*.

Some scholars accept the MT but explain it in terms of Arabic etymology. According to G.R. Driver our phrase means “‘they shall not break line’; for the root ‘*bṭ*’ denotes literally spoiling or disturbing what is sound or intact, as shown by the Arab. ‘*bṭ* I ‘slit’, ‘rent’, and also ‘was slit’ (said of anything whole), ‘clave’ (the ground, said of a plant), ‘disturbed’ the dust (said of the wind), I and VIII ‘rippled’, ‘ruffled’ (the surface of the ground, said of the wind)’”⁽²⁾.

However, as A. Guillaume remarked, neither ‘slit’ nor any of the meanings inherent in this Arabic verb suits the context in Joel⁽³⁾. Guillaume himself appealed to the Arabic verb *hbṭ* which has the basic meaning ‘to fall, beat, strike’ but has developed nuances such as ‘striking or beating in a way that is not right’, ‘striking with the forefeet’, ‘going upon what is not the middle or main part of the road’, and ‘errs from the way’⁽⁴⁾. Guillaume has accordingly translated the Hebrew term as ‘deviate’. This has the merit of being supported by the earliest versional witness and of harmonising with the context as a whole.

But while we may accept Guillaume’s interpretation of the Hebrew ‘*bṭ*’ its phonemic identity with the Arabic root is not direct and immediate. The Hebrew phonemes corresponding to this root are *hbṭ* which is used in the OT of beating out the grain from the husk (Jdt 6,11; Ruth 2,17) and beating

⁽¹⁾ See, e.g. H. P. SMITH, *Joel* (ICC; Edinburgh 1911) 103. *BH³* also reads *y’awwəṭūn*, but *BHS* accepts the MT. The Targum *m’kkbyn* seems to have the basic meaning of ‘curve’, but in the Pael form it seems to denote ‘delay, tarry, prevent’. See M. JASTROW, *A Dictionary of the Targumim..... and the Midrashic Literature II* (London 1903) 1077 f.

⁽²⁾ ‘Studies in the Vocabulary of the Old Testament VI’, *JTS* XXXIV (1933) 378.

⁽³⁾ ‘Hebrew and Arabic Lexicography’, *Abr-Naharin*, 2 (1960-61) 27. For the many meanings of the Arabic root see, e.g., E. W. LANE, *Arabic English Dictionary* (London 1865) BK. I, 5, 1939.

⁽⁴⁾ LANE, *op. cit.*, BK. I, 2, 697 f.

olives from the tree (Deut 24,20). It may be assumed however that like its Arabic cognate it would have been capable of semantic expansion. Hence the image of olives falling from a tree in haphazard and random fashion in turn suggests the concept of disorder and confusion. It is noteworthy too that the Syriac cognate *hbt* basically means 'beat down, shatter', but in its derived conjugations connotes what is erratic and injurious. Thus the Aphel can mean 'to go on kicking or beating the earth', 'to keep kicking the feet', while the Ethpaal means 'to be thrown headlong'(⁵). The Pael of the Aramaic *hbt* again denotes 'to shake, agitate'(⁶) and so suggests the wavering, irregular movement of an indisciplined army on the march.

As already noted, the Septuagint translator regarded the Hebrew verb confronting him as conveying the notion 'to fall away, err'. According to the MT this verb was '*bt*'. In view of the fact that elsewhere in the Old Testament it denotes 'pledge', how did it come to have the force of 'fall away' or the like(?)?

It is suggested here that the explanation lies in the interchange of the gutturals *h* and '*.*'. As, through the loss of aspiration, the Arabic *h* has a tendency to become '*.*'(⁸), so the Hebrew *h* may be reduced to the weaker guttural '*.*'. Thus in Isa 39,2 we read *wysmh* (and he rejoiced, offered greetings) but in the parallel narrative of 2 Kgs 20,13 we find *wysm* (and he heard). *Wysmh* is however the more acceptable reading and is that of the LXX, Peshitta and Vulgate. The name of one of the sons of Aram in the massoretic text of Gen 10,23 is '*wš*', but according to one MS and the Samaritan Version it is *hūš*. In the text of 1 Sam 17,7 we find *hš* 'arrow', but the more probable reading seems to be the *Qere* '*š*' (tree, shaft). A number of *h* and '*.*' variants appear again in the Kennicott findings(⁹) while the letters are likewise confused in the Jerusalem Talmud(¹⁰). If then we regard '*bt*' in Joel 2 as a variant of *hbt* we recognise in it the meaning, earlier discerned by the Septuagint translator, 'decline, turn aside from': 'They do not turn aside from their paths (marching lines)'.

University College of North Wales
Dept. of Biblical Studies
Bangor, Gwynedd LL57 2DG
United Kingdom

C. F. WHITLEY

(⁵) R. PAYNE SMITH, *Syriac English Dictionary* (Oxford 1903) 123.

(⁶) JASTROW, *Dictionary*, II, 417.

(⁷) The lexicons of G. LISOWSKY, *Konkordanz zum Hebraischen Alten Testament* (Stuttgart 1958) 1018, and *KBL* 674 refer to our verb as '*bt*' II, and suggest the meaning 'change', but offer no evidence for this.

(⁸) See WRIGHT, *Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages* (Cambridge 1890) 48; DE LACY O'LEARY, *Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages* (London 1923) 43. P. KAHLE "Die überlieferte Aussprache des Hebräischen und die Punktation der Masoreten", *ZAW* (1921) 230-239, especially 235.

(⁹) A. SPERBER, *A Historical Grammar of Biblical Hebrew* (Leiden 1966) 478 and note 1.

(¹⁰) O'LEARY, *Grammar*, 47.

Allusion, Irony and Wordplay in Micah 1,7*

In the second part of an oracle against Samaria, which may or may not be authentic⁽¹⁾ comes the following two-strophe stanza:

wkl- <i>pslyh</i> yktw	All her statues shall be shattered;
wkl- <i>'tnnyh</i> ys ^h rpw b' ^h š	all her [?] shall be burnt by fire;
wkl- <i>'šbyh</i> 'šym šmmh	all her idols shall I reduce to ruin.
ky m' <i>tnn</i> zwnh qbšh	For, from a whore's hire did she gather(?),
w'd- <i>'tnn</i> zwnh yšwbw	and back to a whore's hire will they go.

In the first three-line strophe the only problem is presented by the word *'tnnyh* since the ostensible meaning "her (whore's) hire" does not fit the pattern of each line⁽²⁾. This pattern is the nominal phrase "all her /idols/" followed by a verbal clause denoting /destruction/. Accordingly, the whole of the second line is usually omitted as a later gloss by translators because it lacks any reference to idols⁽³⁾. If this line is not to be deleted then the noun *'tnn* (here plural) must refer to an object of (pagan) worship condemned by the prophet-poet. To determine what it might be we have to turn to the literary texts from Ugarit.

In the Ugaritic Serpent Incantation⁽⁴⁾ which has spawned quite a number of philological studies most of which I have tried to consult⁽⁵⁾ the following passage occurs (lines 73-76).

tn km <mhry> yhr	"Give as my bride-price, O Serpent,
	(or: O Horon),
tn km mhry <nhšm>	give as my bride-price snakes,
wbn b ^h tn 'itny	(give) serpent-sons (as) my payment" ⁽⁶⁾ .

* The present contribution aims at keeping alive the tradition set by Professor Mitchell Dahood of stimulative short notes on philological topics in poetic texts and is dedicated to his memory.

⁽¹⁾ See the commentaries; the same sentiments recur in Mic 5,12-13.

⁽²⁾ Although *AV*, *RV*, *JB* and *TEV* all translate "earnings" or the like.

⁽³⁾ For example, W. RUDOLPH, *Micha - Nahum - Habakuk - Zephania* (KAT XIII/3; Gütersloh 1975) 33; R. VUILLEUMIER, in R. VUILLEUMIER - C.-A. KELLER, *Michée, Nahoum, Habacuc, Sophonie* (CAT XIb; Neuchâtel 1971) 18, n. 2.

⁽⁴⁾ *Ugaritica* V, text 7, pp. 564-574 = KTU 1.100 = UT 607.

⁽⁵⁾ See D. PARDEE, "A Philological and Prosodic Analysis of the Ugaritic Serpent Incantation UT 607", *JANES* 10 (1978) 73-108, with bibliography. Also C. H. BOWMAN - R. B. COOTE, "A Narrative Incantation for Snake Bite", *UF* 12 (1980) 135-140; M. DIETRICH - O. LORETZ, "Die Bannung von Schlangengift (KTU 1.100 and KTU 1.107:7b-13a. 19b-20)", *UF* 12 (1980) 171-182.

⁽⁶⁾ This is my own reconstruction of the text as "staircase parallelism" based on suggestions by AVISHUR, *UF* 4 (1972) 4 and PARDEE, *Analysis*, 99-100, and

ytt nhšm mhrk
bn bñn 'itnnk

"I herewith give snakes as your bride-price,
serpent-sons as your payment"(7).

Pardee comments that *mhr* means "bride-price" in Hebrew, Ugaritic, Arabic and Aramaic, and adds:

Considering the established usage for *mhr*, it must be assumed that 'itnn is a generic word for gift (cf. Hebrew *mtn*), a more specific word for gift given by a man to a woman, or more specifically yet, a gift given by the groom to the bride at marriage(8).

The corresponding term in Hebrew is obviously much narrower referring as it does to a commercial transaction at a much lower level(9). Various explanations have been put forward for this Ugaritic text as a whole but however it is interpreted, in the lines quoted above snakes are equated with payment made for a wife, a key factor in the argument presented here.

The Hebrew word 'itnn occurs three times in our Micah passage. In the final couplet it undeniably means "(prostitute's) price" as elsewhere in Hebrew. In the preceding tricolon, however, as already noted, it cannot possibly have the same meaning, parallel, as it is, to the two words *psl* and 'šb. Instead, I suggest it to be a variant of the noun *tannîn*, "sea-serpent, dragon" (Ug. *tnn*) here spelt with prosthetic aleph(10). It is noteworthy that the plural of 'itnn is found only here. Whether the reference is to an actual reptile as an object of worship or whether 'itnn, "serpent", is used only for the sake of parallelism(11) is not clear.

The significance of the last couplet is obscure: why should idols etc. have been "gathered" from a prostitute's fee and how could they subsequently return to this payment? It is possible that *qbšh* is not a verb (whether "she gathered", or with emendation, "were gathered")(12) but a suffixed noun. The meaning of Hebrew *qbš* (perhaps as *qibbûš*) would then match Ug. *qbš* as in *pñr qbš dtn*, "the gathering of the Ditan clan"(13) in the extended meaning of "pantheon"(14). I would accordingly translate:

n. 99. The text on the tablet runs: *tn. km. nhšm. yñr. tn. km/ mñry. wbn. bñn. 'itnny/ ytt. nhšm. mhrk. bn bñn/ 'itnnk/* - with / marking line-end. The copyist omitted the first occurrence of *mñry* transposing in its place *nhšm* from the second line of the tricolon. He had previously left out *nhš* from line 6, several letters here and there and possibly a complete stanza after line 34 (on which see PARDEE, *Analysis*, 87).

(7) The use in both Mic 1,7 and the Ugaritic text of a stanza comprising a three-line and a two-line strophe is one of many pointers to a common poetic tradition, no more.

(8) PARDEE, *Analysis*, 101.

(9) See Deut 23,19; Isa 23,17-18; Ezek 16,31.34.41 and Hos 9,1.

(10) Consult GKC, § 19m and JOÜON, *Grammaire*, §§ 17a and 88 L a. Examples are *tmwl* and 'tmwl, "yesterday" (with prosthetic aleph followed by *t*) and *zrw* or 'zrw, "arm".

(11) Comparable is the triple set *psl* // 'lylym // kl-'lhym in Ps 97,7. For the (inverted) pair 'šb // *psl* (+ *nsk*) see Isa 48,5.

(12) See apparatus in BHK.

(13) CTA 14 iii 4 and 15. On Ug. *qbš*, "clan", see MACDONALD, *UF* 11 (1979) 523.

(14) This meaning has already been proposed by DAHOOD, *Bib* 52 (1971) 343-345 for Isa 57,12-13a.

"For from a hussy's hire is her pantheon,
and back to a hussy's hire will they go".

Without pressing the logical argument too closely⁽¹⁵⁾ I understand this to mean that Samaria used her ill-gotten gains to provide statues of gods for worship (including, perhaps, images of snakes) much as in Judg 17,1-5, and that once shattered, burnt and melted down these same idols will once again become mere money. The *'tnn zwnh*, converted into a *qbš* of *psl*, *'tnn* and *'šb*, will be turned back into *'tnn zwnh*⁽¹⁶⁾.

The text linking "serpent(-idols)" in Mic 1,7b with "(prostitute's) fee" used twice in 1,7a is the Ugaritic passage already quoted. Without this "intertext"⁽¹⁷⁾ the two strophes in Micah would be unintelligible. The poet is alluding to the tradition recorded in the Ugaritic "Snake" tablet and at the same time playing on twin meanings of *'tnn*. It is a measure of his skill that he could provide an alternative pronunciation of *tannin* to achieve the desired effect which, with its obligatory element of irony belongs fully to a long tradition of idol-polemic⁽¹⁸⁾.

8 Rosemount
Morpeth, Northumberland
England

Wilfred G. E. WATSON

⁽¹⁵⁾ A similar solution, along different lines is set out by SMITH in the ICC commentary, (Edinburgh 1911) 40 based on the hypothetical root *tnn*, "to resemble, be equal".

⁽¹⁶⁾ Note, incidentally, that the parallelism of *qbš* with *šwb* occurs in Jer 23,3. For the motif of idols consumed by fire cf. Deut 7,5,25.

⁽¹⁷⁾ A convenient discussion of intertextuality is available in M. RIFFATERRE, *Semiotics of Poetry* (Bloomington 1978). "A major point on which there would be agreement [in semiotics] . . . is that literary works are to be considered not as autonomous entities, 'organic wholes', but as intertextual constructs: sequences which have meaning in relation to other texts which they take up, cite, parody, refute, or generally transform." - J. CULLER, *The Pursuit of Signs. Semiotics, Literature, Deconstruction* (London - Henley 1981) 38; see, also 100-118. For the function of allusion cf. C. SCHAAR, "Vertical context systems", *Style and Text* (FS. N. E. ENKVIST; [ed. H. RINGBOM *et al.*] Stockholm 1975) 146-157.

⁽¹⁸⁾ E.g. Isa 45,20-21; 48,14-20.

Dan 6,8: An Aramaic Reflex of Assyrian Legal Terminology

In his study of the Aramaic legal papyri from Elephantine, Y. Muffs established the Neo-Assyrian provenience of the Aramaic formularies at Elephantine⁽¹⁾. In the course of his investigation he referred to Neo-Assyrian deeds from the ninth century which are provided with brief Aramaic summaries or dockets introduced by the word דנת. He correctly identified דנת as a loan translation⁽²⁾ from the Assyrian *dannatu* "valid deed"⁽³⁾. A similar semantic development from this root which primarily denotes "strength" to that which is "legitimate, binding" is also evidenced in the corresponding adjective, *dannu*⁽⁴⁾, as well as in the feminine plurale tantum, *dannātu*⁽⁵⁾. All three may refer to a "binding agreement".

Muffs⁽⁶⁾, Greenfield⁽⁷⁾, Loewenstamm⁽⁸⁾, and Kaufman⁽⁹⁾ further suggested that the Nabatean דתק, "valid document"⁽¹⁰⁾, is a calque of this very same Assyrian *dannatu*, again demonstrating the identical internal development from its base meaning, "strength", to a "strong", i.e., "valid and binding document". The latter two then compared this substantive to its coun-

(1) Y. MUFFS, *Studies in the Aramaic Legal Papyri from Elephantine* (Leiden 1969) 179-189.

(2) Ibid. 187. On p. 196 he also refers to Middle Babylonian analogues of the *tuppu dannatu* as cited in L. OPPENHEIM's study, "Ein Beitrag zum Kassitenproblem", *AnOr* 12 (1935) 266-274.

(3) For *dannatu* (8), *CAD, D*, 90-91, "valid tablet".

(4) For *dannu* (2), *CAD, D*, 95, "valid".

(5) For *dannātu* (2), *CAD, D*, 91, "binding agreement".

(6) *Studies*, 208.

(7) J. GREENFIELD is cited as reaching the same conclusion independently (oral communication) in MUFFS, *Studies*, 208. See now his note in his "Studies in the Legal Terminology of the Nabatean Funerary Inscriptions" (Heb.), *Sefer Hanoch Levin* (Ramat Gan 1974) 73, n. 49, where he, in turn, refers back to MUFFS, *Studies*, 208. GREENFIELD brings examples of the Nabatean terms דתק (197: 2-3; 222: 3-4; כתב או דתק (224: 2-3; cf. 207: 5-6) and concludes that the two are very similar, with only a possibly small distinction between them.

(8) S. E. LOEWENSTAMM, "Esther 9: 29-32: The Genesis of a Late Addition", *HUCA* 42 (1971) 119-120. He views the two as participating in a parallel semantic development.

(9) S. A. KAUFMAN, *The Akkadian Influences on Aramaic* (Chicago 1974) 46. He does question, however, on that page, n. 72, Muffs' reference to *AP* 10: 23. This document is referred to by MUFFS on p. 189 of his study and not as cited by KAUFMAN on p. 184. Correct accordingly.

(10) For Nabatean דתק, see C. F. JEAN and J. HOFTIJZER, *Dictionnaire des Inscriptions Sémitiques de l'Ouest = DISO* (Leiden 1965) 333, דתק I, adj. "valable, légitime", דתק (CIS ii 197: 3; 215: 3; 224: 4), "un document légitime"; דתק II, noun, "titre valide" (CIS ii 207: 3,6; 210: 4; 224: 3, J 5: 3,6).

terpart in biblical Hebrew, תָּקַף, in Est 9,29⁽¹¹⁾. In this passage most exegetes interpret the phrase כָּל תָּקַף as meaning "with all power/strength" or "with full authority"⁽¹²⁾, and translate the verse, "Then Queen Esther, daughter of Abihail, wrote a second letter of Purim for the purpose of confirming with full authority the aforementioned one of Mordecai the Jew"⁽¹³⁾. This verse is part of the pericope of Est 9,29-32 which is considered by many scholars as being a later interpolation⁽¹⁴⁾. Loewenstamm, concurring with the majority opinion, subjected this unit to a minute textual analysis in order to reconstruct the assumed complex process leading to its final redaction⁽¹⁵⁾. After outlining the internal problems of verse 29 and comparing the MT with the Septuagint translation, he suggests that תָּקַף must refer to something written⁽¹⁶⁾. If the meaning were "with full authority", one would expect the presence of the preposition ב, כָּל תָּקַף, and not אֵת כָּל תָּקַף as is in the received Hebrew text⁽¹⁷⁾. Hence he concludes that the noun here means a "deed of legal strength" and, *en passant*, refers to Assy. *dannatu* and Nab. תָּקַף⁽¹⁸⁾. He then goes on to translate the verse as follows: "Esther and Mordecai wrote the whole valid deed of this Purim epistle", i.e., "the epistle recorded in verse 26". According to Loewenstamm neither the Greek translator nor the last redactor of the MT was aware of this special meaning of תָּקַף. The scribes, he suggests, understood it not as a comment on verse 26 but as a second act of legislation confirming the first. He thus assumes that both לְקִיּוֹם and הַשְׁנִיּוֹת in this verse are secondary additions⁽¹⁹⁾.

Though we agree with him that תָּקַף refers here to a "valid document", we would like nevertheless to suggest another line of interpretation for the remainder of the sentence: לְקִיּוֹם אֵת אַגְרֵת הַפּוּרִים הַזֶּה הַשְׁנִיּוֹת. It should be noted that in those very same Neo-Assyrian deeds which are accompanied by Aramaic summaries, eleven dockets are introduced by the noun רִנָּה⁽²⁰⁾ and one by אַגְרָת = Akk. *egirtu*⁽²¹⁾. The origin of this substantive and its direction of borrowing (from Neo-Assyrian into Aramaic or vice versa) are still the sub-

⁽¹¹⁾ LOEWENSTAMM and KAUFMAN, loc. cit.

⁽¹²⁾ See the standard translations. C. A. MOORE, *Esther* (Garden City 1971) 95, translates, "with full authority", lit. "with full power", but does note the occurrence of *tqp* in Nabatean inscriptions. E. WÜRTHWEIN, *Die fünf Megilloth* (Tübingen 1969) 196, on the other hand, totally misunderstood the import of the verse.

⁽¹³⁾ So *NJPS*.

⁽¹⁴⁾ For the different opinions, see LOEWENSTAMM, "Esther", 118.

⁽¹⁵⁾ "Esther", 118-120.

⁽¹⁶⁾ "Esther", 119.

⁽¹⁷⁾ Already noted by P. Haupt and referred to by LOEWENSTAMM, "Esther", 118, n. 4.

⁽¹⁸⁾ On p. 119, n. 11, he also brings the Nabatean evidence for תָּקַף and regards כָּתַב תָּקַף "as a hendiadys, תָּקַף as a shortened expression".

⁽¹⁹⁾ He even thinks that different scribes were responsible for the insertion of each of these words and "that the final text arose from a conflation of both additions", p. 120.

⁽²⁰⁾ See L. DELAPORTE, *Épigraphes araméennes* (Paris 1912) documents 8-18.

⁽²¹⁾ Ibid. 38, document 19. Also referred to by MUFFS, op. cit., 187 and n. 4.

ject of much scholarly discussion⁽²²⁾. Irrespective as to which language is ultimately proven to be the ultimate source, it is patently clear that in these Aramaic documents אגרת alternates with and has the same approximate meaning as דנת. Thus אגרת כספא די על זון⁽²³⁾ is to be translated, "The legal deed⁽²⁴⁾ of (= concerning) the money which Z. owes". In Neo-Assyrian documents as well *egirtu* at times specifically refers to a "legal document"⁽²⁵⁾: *egirtu ša dēni ina birtuššunu issaṭru*, "They drew up a legal document concerning the agreement between them". Compare also, *5 manē ina libbi egirti issaṭar*, "five minas of silver were recorded in a contract"⁽²⁶⁾.

The verse in Esther should now be reconsidered in the light of this evidence. For in this very same passage there appear Heb. תקף (= Assy. *dannatu*, Aram. דנת, Nab. תקף) and Heb. אגרת (= Assy. *egirtu*, Aram. אגרת), both substantives which may refer to legally valid documents in this period. It may be conjectured that these two terms were originally variants of one another, both of which were eventually preserved in the same verse and thus necessarily subsequently reinterpreted⁽²⁷⁾. This suggestion may help explain the puzzling last word, השנית "the second" — that is an editorial attempt to reconcile an apparent duplication in terminology⁽²⁸⁾.

The purpose of this note, however, is to extend the scope of the investigation from the noun תקף to the verb תקף which appears in Dan 6,8. In this passage the political and administrative hierarchy of the Persian government in collusion persuade King Darius⁽²⁹⁾ to publish a royal edict forbidding all to address any request or prayer to any god or human being except to the king himself, upon the penalty of being tossed into the lions' den. The legal wording of the Aramaic, לקימה קים מלכא לתקפה אסר, is yet another example of the literary phenomenon of parallel phrases which exemplify rhetorical elements in the prose passages of Daniel (e.g., 4,16; 5,10)⁽³⁰⁾. The

⁽²²⁾ See KAUFMAN's discussion, *Akkadian Influences*, 48 and n.81, and MUFFS, *Studies*.

⁽²³⁾ DELAPORTE, *Épigraphes*, 38.

⁽²⁴⁾ אגרת here means a "legal deed" and not a "letter"; so correctly MUFFS, *Studies*, and DISO, 4, "contrat", referring to the same document; but incorrectly DELAPORTE, *Épigraphes*, "lettre".

⁽²⁵⁾ CAD, E, 46, *egirtu*, NA, 2, "legal document". See now J. N. POSTGATE, *Fifty Neo-Assyrian Legal Documents* (Warminster 1976) Text 48, 166-168, lines 4-5.

⁽²⁶⁾ Both references are cited from CAD, loc. cit.

⁽²⁷⁾ Or could אגרת have originally served as an explanatory gloss for תקף which in its nominal and adjectival forms in all other biblical verses refers to "strength", cf. Est 10,2 and Dan 11,17? (For Aramaic, cf. Dan. 2,37.40.42; 3,33; 4,27; 7,7; Ezra 4,20). Only here does it appear with the meaning of a legally valid document.

⁽²⁸⁾ Heb. השנית does not appear in the Septuagint and Syriac translations and many scholars either delete it as a gloss or emend it. The suggestion in BHP, לקיים תקף אגרת, would be very similar to the expression כתב תקף in the Nabatean inscriptions; see above n. 7.

⁽²⁹⁾ As for the actual identification of this non-existent "Median" Darius, see the modern commentaries.

⁽³⁰⁾ J. GREENFIELD, "Early Aramaic Poetry", *JANES* 11 (1979) 47.

first half of this expression *קים מלכא* means “to establish/confirm/publish⁽³¹⁾ a royal edict”. For the legal nuance of this verb, cf. Heb. *לקיים*, Est 9, 29.31 and Ruth 4,7, as well as its occurrence in an Aramaic inscription from Assyria⁽³²⁾.

The exact nuance of the second half, *לתקפה אטר*, however, has been almost totally overlooked. Usually it is rendered, “to make strong a prohibition”, “to issue a strong prohibition”, or “to put into force an interdict”⁽³³⁾. But actually *תקפה*, the *Pa'el* infinitive of *תקף*, is none other than the interdialectal semantic equivalent of the Assyrian verb *dunnunu*. This latter verb, similar to the semantic development of the nominal form, *dannatu*, just described above, also develops from its basic meaning, “to strengthen”, a legal connotation, “to make valid and binding”⁽³⁴⁾. This technical meaning is already attested in Old Assyrian, *ṭuppušu ludanninma*, “Let him make his tablet binding”⁽³⁵⁾. And it reappears in Neo-Assyrian documents, e.g., *udannina rikšāte*, “He made the treaty binding”⁽³⁶⁾, and it is documented several times in the vassal treaties of Esarhaddon, e.g., *adē ina muḫḫišu issīkunu udan-ninūni iškunūni*⁽³⁷⁾. The translation here should not be, “And concerning

⁽³¹⁾ For the legal nuance of Heb. *לקיים* (להקים), see the various notes of M. WEINFELD, “The Covenant of Grant in the Old Testament and the Ancient Near East”, *JAOS* 90 (1970) 188 and n. 33; “Covenant Terminology in the Ancient Near East and Its Influence on the West”, *JAOS* 93 (1973) 197; and “ברית”, *TWAT* I, 788. For the distinction between the *Hiph'il*, להקים, and *Pi'el*, לקיים, see A. HURVITZ, *A Linguistic Study of the Relationship between the Priestly Source and the Book of Ezekiel* (Paris 1982) 32-35. Hurvitz shows by means of his diachronical study that *קים* is the distinctively later form, evident in late biblical texts and in rabbinic literature. — For another occurrence of this very same idiom *קים*, see now 11 *Qṭg Job* 35: 6-7, *היקים קים עמך*, which is the Aramaic Targum to Job 40,28, *היכרת ברית עמך*, “Will it make an alliance/covenant with you?”, J. A. FITZMYER and D. J. HARRINGTON, *A Manual of Palestinian Aramaic Texts* (Rome 1978) 42. See also M. SOKOLOFF, *The Targum to Job from Qumran Cave XI* (Ramat Gan 1974) 96. His comment on p. 162, “On the basis of BA (D 6⁸) and TO (e.g. Dt 8¹⁸), *qym* should be analyzed as *qwm* (pa.)”, would be additional support for Hurvitz’s comments above on this verbal form. Note that adjective *קים* also appears in Nabatean inscriptions with the meaning “valuable, legitimate”. Cf. *כתב תקי מן יד עידו קים לה*, “un document authentique de la main de A. valable pour lui”, *DISO*, 258.

⁽³²⁾ *KAI*, I, 46, text 233, line 9. See Band II, 283, for translation, and p. 285 for note. It was overlooked, however, that the same sequence of verbs appears in this inscription as well as in Est 9,29 (*כתב... וקיימ: כתב... קים*).

⁽³³⁾ See the standard modern translations.

⁽³⁴⁾ For *dunnunu*, see *CAD*, D, 85 2' d, and *AHW*, 159b, 7d.

⁽³⁵⁾ Cited as one of the examples in *CAD*, loc. cit. However, as the following citations show, the use of *dunnunu* “to make valid, binding” is not limited to Old Assyrian texts, as *CAD* states, but is current in Neo-Assyrian as well. VON SODEN, loc. cit., cites the Neo-Assyrian but translates, “verstärken”. The Old Assyrian citations are listed, loc. cit., under D8, but not with their correct legal nuance.

⁽³⁶⁾ M. STRECK, *Assurbanipal und die letzten assyrischen Könige bis zum Untergang Niniveh's* [= *VAB* 7] (Leipzig 1916) Vol. II, 4, 1.22.

⁽³⁷⁾ D. J. WISEMAN, *The Vassal Treaties of Esarhaddon* (London 1958) 33, lines 64-65. See also lines 23-24 and 286-287 for the same usage of the verb.

whom he has firmly imposed the treaty upon you”⁽³⁸⁾, but rather, “And concerning whom he has made the treaty binding upon you”.

In Daniel, as well, the correct legal nuance of תַּקַּף is “to make valid and binding”. Thus the Aramaic אַסַּר תַּקַּף is the exact cognate equivalent of Assyrian *riksa dunnunu*, in which both the nouns אַסַּר and *riksu* represent terms for “obligatory bonds”, and both the verbs תַּקַּף and *dunnunu*, signify “to ratify”⁽³⁹⁾. In sum, alongside of the manifold influences of Neo-Assyrian legal vocabulary upon Aramaic can now be added the intensive verb from *dunnunu* = תַּקַּף, “to make a document legally binding and valid”.

The Hebrew Univ. of Jerusalem
Faculty of Humanities
Jerusalem 91905

Shalom PAUL

⁽³⁸⁾ Ibid. 34 and the corresponding translations to the other lines cited in the above note.

⁽³⁹⁾ After completing this study it was a pleasant surprise to discover that one scholar had made note of this correspondence. See WEINFELD, *TWAT*, I, 784; “The Vassal Treaties of Esarhaddon — An Annotated Translation” [Heb.], *Shnaton: An Annual for Biblical and Near Eastern Studies*, Vol. I (Jerusalem 1975) 89, n. 5; “The Counsel of the Elders to Rehoboam” [Heb.], *Leshonenu* 36 (1971) 10-11, n. 49; and now in his expanded English version, “The Counsel of the ‘Elders’ to Rehoboam and its Implications”, *Maarav* 3/1 (1982) 46-48, n. 95.

Le prophète «saint» Jérémie dans le ménologe impérial byzantin

Jérémie est inscrit au calendrier de l'Église grecque, d'ordinaire au 1^{er} mai ou au 4 novembre⁽¹⁾. Le jour de sa fête, on lit à l'office soit les «Paralipomènes de Jérémie» sur la prise de Jérusalem par les Babyloniens⁽²⁾, soit un extrait des Vies des prophètes attribuées à Épiphanes de Chypre⁽³⁾, soit encore un éloge anonyme⁽⁴⁾.

La notice ci-dessous est tirée du ménologe impérial, rédigé pour Michel IV le Paphlagonien (1039-1041)⁽⁵⁾. Elle s'inspire d'abord des «Paralipomènes de Jérémie», ensuite d'une recension des *Vitae prophetarum*⁽⁶⁾. Elle n'est conservée, semble-t-il, que dans un manuscrit du XIV^e siècle, le Patmensis 736, où elle figure au 1^{er} mai⁽⁷⁾.

Ὑπόμνημα εἰς τὸν ἅγιον Ἰερεμίαν τὸν προφήτην
e codice Patmensi 736, fol. 174-176.

1. «Renoncez aux œuvres de Babylone». Fondation de Samarie.

Ἰερεμίας ὁ κλεινὸς καὶ μέγας προφήτης, ὁ καὶ ἐξ αὐτῆς μήτρας ἁγιασθεὶς, Χελκίου μὲν ἐνὸς τῶν ἱερέων υἱὸς ἐστὶ τε καὶ γνωρίζεται, κατῴκει δὲ τὴν Ἀναθώμ ἐν γῇ Βενιαμίν⁽⁸⁾. Πρὸς αὐτὸν οὖν λόγος ἐγένετο κυρίου περὶ τῆς αἰχμαλωσίας Ἱερουσαλὴμ, ὡς ἐστὶ παρὰ τοῦ βασιλέως Χαλδαίων εἰς ἐρήμωσιν. Ἐφ' ᾧ καὶ θρήνον συνεστήσατο, τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ ψῆφον ἰδὼν ἀπαρέγκλητον, ὡς ἐν τοῖς Παραλιπομένοις⁽⁹⁾ ἔστιν εὐρεῖν. Εἰς Βαβυλῶνα τοιγαροῦν συναπαχθεὶς καὶ αὐτὸς τῷ λαῷ, προφητικῶς αὐτοῖς εὐηγγελίζετο τὴν ἐπάνοδον. Παρῇνει δὲ ὁμῶς τοὺς ἐθέλοντας τὴν γῆν τῆς ἐπαγγελίας ἰδεῖν

⁽¹⁾ *Synax. Eccl. CP.* (1902) 645-647; cf. 193-194 (cod. M); *Menaea*, Maii 1 et Nov. 4.

⁽²⁾ *Bibliotheca hagiographica Graeca et Novum Auctarium*, n° 777-778b.

⁽³⁾ *BHG* 778d, e, f.

⁽⁴⁾ *Ibid.* 779.

⁽⁵⁾ Cf. *Anal. Boll.* 57 (1939) 225-232; A. EHRHARD, *Überlieferung...*, t. 3 (*T.U.* 52, 1943), p. 341-442.

⁽⁶⁾ Th. SCHERMANN, *Prophetarum Vitae fabulosae...* (1907), p. 71-73 (*BHG* 1588).

⁽⁷⁾ EHRHARD, l.c., p. 372-383.

⁽⁸⁾ Cf. Jr 1,1.5. Lire Ἀναθώθ, comme dans la Bible.

⁽⁹⁾ Voir ci-dessus, la note 2 de l'Introduction.

[col. 2] καταλείψαι τὰ τῆς Βαβυλῶνος ἔργα⁽¹⁰⁾, τοὺς ἄρρενας μὲν ἄσπερ ἐξ αὐτῆς ἐγήμαντο γαμετάς, τὰς δὲ γε θηλείας οὓς συνηρμόσαντο ἄνδρας. «Τοῦτο γάρ, φησί, μὴ γινόμενου, οὐκ ὄψεσθε τὴν Ἱερουσαλήμ, λέγει κύριος.» Πολλοὶ μὲν οὖν, ἐξιόντων αὐτῶν, ὑπελείφθησαν ἐν τῇ Βαβυλῶνι, ἄνδρες ὁμοῦ καὶ γυναῖκες, τῶν ἀνδρῶν· «Οὐ μὴ καταλείψαιμεν, φησάντων, τὰς γυναῖκας ἡμῶν⁽¹¹⁾» — «Οὐθ' ἡμεῖς τοὺς ἄνδρας ἡμῶν» τῶν γυναικῶν εἰπουσῶν. Ἄλλοι δὲ τὸν Ἰορδάνην περᾶσαντες τὴν Ἱερουσαλήμ κατελιφάσι.

Βαρούχ οὖν τότε καὶ Ἀβιμέλεχ, οἱ μὴ συναπήχθησαν τῷ λαῷ πρὸς τὴν Βαβυλῶνα, σὺν Ἱερεμίᾳ στάντες πρὸς τῇ πύλῃ τῆς πόλεως· «Πᾶς, εἶπον, ὁ τοῖς Βαβυλωνίοις τῆς συνοικήσεως [174] κοινωνῶν οὐκ εἰσέλθῃ τῇδε τὴν πόλιν.» Καὶ ἅμα πολλοὶ τὴν Βαβυλῶνα κατέλαβον ὑποστρέψαντες· μὴ συγχωρηθέντες δὲ ταύτην εἰσελθεῖν αὐθις ὑποστρέφουσι· καὶ τόπον κατελιφότες ἔρημον, μακρόθεν τῆς Ἱερουσαλήμ διακείμενοι πόλιν ἐν αὐτῷ ἑαυτοῖς ῥυπαροποίησαν καὶ ταύτην κατέφηκαν, Σαμαρίαν αὐτὴν ὀνομάσαντες⁽¹²⁾.

2. *Vision de Jérémie. Sa mort et sa translation à Alexandrie.*

Ὁ τοίνυν Ἱερεμίας ἐν ἐκστάσει γεγωνῶς ποτε, μεθ' ὁ τρεῖς ἡμέραι παρεληλύθεσαν καὶ τοῖς λαοῖς ἔδοξε τεθνάναι, αἰφνης ἐπῆρε τὴν αὐτοῦ φωνὴν ἐν μέσῳ πάντων καὶ εἶπε· «Δοξάσατε πάντες τὸν θεὸν καὶ τὸν αὐτοῦ μονογενῆ υἱόν, τὸν ἐξυπνίζοντα ἡμᾶς. Ἐτη γὰρ ἔσται μετὰ τοὺς καιροὺς τούτους ἑπτακόσια ἑβδομήκοντα καὶ ἑπτὰ, [col. 2] καὶ ἔρχεται εἰς τὴν γῆν τὸ δένδρον τῆς ζωῆς, τὸ μέσον φυτευθὲν ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ· καὶ ποιήσει πάντα τὰ δένδρα τὰ ἄκαρπα ποιῆσαι καρπόν, καὶ αὐξηθήσονται καὶ βλαστήσουσι· καὶ τὰ βεβλαστηκότα καὶ μεγαλαυχοῦντα καὶ λέγοντα· Ἐδώκαμεν τὸ τέλος ἡμῶν τῷ ἄερί, ποιήσει αὐτὰ ξηρανθῆναι μετὰ τοῦ ὕψους τῶν κλάδων αὐτῶν⁽¹³⁾.»

Ταῦτα λέγοντος Ἱερεμίου καὶ προφητεύοντος περὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὀργῆς πλησθεὶς ὁ λαός· «Ταῦτα πάλιν ἐστὶ τὰ ῥήματα, λέγει, ἃ καὶ Ἡσαΐας υἱὸς Ἀμώς προὔλεγεν ὅτι Ἐἶδον τὸν θεὸν καὶ τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ. Δεῦτε οὖν καὶ μὴ ἀποκτείνωμεν αὐτὸν ὡς ἐκείνον, ἀλλὰ λίθοις αὐτὸν καταχόσωμεν⁽¹⁴⁾.»

Ἦλθεν οὖν Ἱερεμίας μετὰ τὸ παραδοῦναι τὰ μυστήρια τῷ Βαρούχ· καὶ ὡς εἶδεν αὐτὸν ὁ λαός, ἔδραμον [175] ἐπ' αὐτὸν μετὰ λίθων πολλῶν καὶ συνέχωσαν αὐτὸν ἐν Τάφναις Αἰγύπτου⁽¹⁵⁾. Κεῖται δὲ ἐν τῷ τόπῳ τῆς οἰκῆσεως Φαραώ. Ἐδόξασαν καὶ γὰρ αὐτὸν οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι, εὐεργετηθέντες πλεῖστα δι' αὐτοῦ. Τὰ δὲ τῆς εὐεργεσίας τοῦτον ἔχει τὸν τρόπον. Ἀσπίδες ἐνεφιλοχῶρουν τῷ τόπῳ καὶ κατέβλαπτον αὐτοῦς· εὐχῇ τοῦ προφήτου πᾶσαι τεθνή-

⁽¹⁰⁾ Cf. *Paralipomena Ieremiae*, § 8 (éd. R. HARRIS, p. 60; éd. KRAFT, p. 40).

⁽¹¹⁾ Ibid. (HARRIS, p. 61; KRAFT, p. 42).

⁽¹²⁾ Ibid. (HARRIS, p. 62; KRAFT, p. 42).

⁽¹³⁾ *Paralip.*, § 9 (HARRIS, p. 62-63; KRAFT, p. 44-46).

⁽¹⁴⁾ Cf. *ibid.* (HARRIS, p. 63-64; KRAFT, p. 46).

⁽¹⁵⁾ L'auteur puise à une autre source. Après les *Paralipomènes de Jérémie*, ce sont les *Vitae prophetarum*, seconde recension d'Épiphane (SCHERMANN, p. 61-63) ou plutôt recension anonyme BHG 1588 (SCHERMANN, p. 71-73).

κασιν. Ἀλλὰ δὴ καὶ τῶν ὑδάτων οἱ θῆρες οὓς καλοῦσι μὲν Αἰγύπτιοι νεφώτ, Ἕλληνες δὲ κροκοδείλους, ἀνιόντες καὶ μεγάλα καταλυμαινόμενοι τούτους, εὐχαῖς ἐκείνους τοῖς ὕδασι νάπαθέσαν. Καὶ νῦν ἔστιν ἰδεῖν ἐκ τοῦδε τοῦ τόπου τοὺς πιστοὺς ἔχον λαμβάνοντας ἀσπίδων δῆγματα δι' αὐτοῦ θεραπεύειν καὶ αὐτὰ δὲ τὰ τῶν ὑδάτων θηρία ἀποσοβεῖν ὁμοῦ [col. 2] καὶ νεκροῦν. Φασὶ δὲ τινες τῶν Ἀντιγόνου καὶ Πτολεμαίου παίδων, γερόντων ἀνδρῶν ἀκοῦσαι καὶ ἐμπείρων ὅτιπερ Ἀλέξανδρος ὁ Μακεδὼν ἐπὶ τοῦ τόπου γενόμενος τοῦ προφήτου καὶ γνοὺς τὰ ὑπ' αὐτοῦ λαληθέντα, πρὸς Ἀλεξάνδρειαν αὐτοῦ τὰ λείψανα μετηνέγκατο, κύκλῳ ταῦτα τῆς πόλεως περιθεῖς φιλοτίμως· ὅθεν καὶ τῆς γῆς ἐκείνης αἱ ἀσπίδες ἐξωλοθρεύθησαν, ἀλλὰ μὴν καὶ τοῦ ποταμοῦ τὰ θηρία. Λέγεται δὲ καὶ τοῦτο ὥς, ὅφεις ἐκ τοῦ Πελαγονικοῦ Ἀργους κομίσας, τοῖς ὕδασι ἐκείνοις ἐνέβαλεν, ὅθεν καὶ Ἀργόλαι⁽¹⁶⁾ καλοῦνται.

3. La vierge-mère, l'arche d'alliance; le nom de Dieu gravé dans la pierre.

Οὗτος οὖν ὁ θεόπνοος προφήτης καὶ σημεῖον τοῖς Αἰγυπτίων ἱερεῦσι δέδωκεν ὅτιπερ τὰ εἰδῶλα αὐτῶν δεῖ σεισθῆναι καὶ συμπεσεῖν, [175] παιδίου σωτήρος ἐκ παρθένου γεννωμένου ἐν φάτνῃ. Καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἕως νῦν θεοποιοῦσι παρθένον λεγῶ καὶ βρέφος ἐν φάτνῃ τιθέντες προσκυνοῦσι. Διὰ τοι τοῦτο καὶ Πτολεμαίῳ τῷ βασιλεῖ πυνθανομένῳ τὴν αἰτίαν ἔλεγον ὅτι «Πατροπαράδοτόν ἐστι τὸ μυστήριον, ὑπὸ προφήτου μεγάλου παραδοθὲν τοῖς πατράσιν ἡμῶν» καὶ ὅτιπερ «Ἐκδεχόμεθα τὸ πέρας τοῦ μυστηρίου.»

Λέγεται περὶ τοῦ μεγάλου τούτου προφήτου καὶ ὅτι πρὸ τῆς ἀλώσεως τοῦ ναοῦ τὴν τοῦ νόμου κιβωτὸν ἥρπαξε καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ· καὶ ἐποίησεν ὑπὸ πέτρας ταῦτα καταποθεῖναι· καὶ πρὸς τοὺς παρεστῶτας εἶπεν· «Ἀπεδήμησε κύριος ἐκ Σινᾶ εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν· καὶ πάλιν ἐλεύσεται νομοθετῆσαι ἐν Σινᾶ ἐν δυνάμει. Καὶ [col. 2] σημεῖον ὑμῖν ἔσται τῆς παρουσίας αὐτοῦ ὅταν ξύλον πάντα τὰ ἔθνη προσκυνήσωσιν.» Ἐφῆσε δὲ καὶ τοῦτο ὅτι «Τὴν κιβωτὸν ταύτην οὐδεὶς ἐκβαλεῖ εἰ μὴ Ἀαρὼν μόνος ὁ ἱερεὺς· καὶ τὰς ἐν αὐτῇ πλάκας οὐδεὶς ἀναπτύξει οὐκέτι οὐχ ἱερέων οὐδὲ προφητῶν εἰ μὴ Μωϋσῆς ὁ ἐκλεκτὸς τοῦ θεοῦ. Καὶ ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει πρῶτον ἡ κιβωτὸς ἀναστήσεται καὶ ἐξελεύσεται καὶ τεθήσεται ἐν ὄρει Σινᾶ· καὶ πάντες οἱ ἅγιοι πρὸς αὐτὴν συναχθήσονται ἐκδεχόμενοι τὸν κύριον καὶ φεύγοντες τὸν ἐχθρόν, ἀνελεῖν ἐθέλοντα τούτους.»

Ἐν δὲ τῇ πέτρᾳ ἐσφράγισε τῷ δακτύλῳ αὐτοῦ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ θεοῦ· καὶ ἐγένετο ὁ τύπος ὥς γραφὴ σιδήρου· καὶ νεφέλη φωτεινὴ ἐσκέπασε τὸ ὄνομα. Καὶ οὐδεὶς νοήσει τὸν τόπον οὐδὲ ἀναγνῶναι αὐτὸ δυνήσεται ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας [176] ἐκείνης. Ἔστι δὲ ἡ πέτρα ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ ὅπου πρῶτον ἡ κιβωτὸς γέγονε μεταξὺ τῶν δύο ὁρέων, ἔνθα κεῖται Μωϋσῆς καὶ Ἀαρὼν. Καὶ ἐν νυκτὶ ὥς πῦρ ἡ νεφέλη φαίνεται⁽¹⁷⁾ κατὰ τὸν τύπον τὸν ἀρχαῖον.

⁽¹⁶⁾ ἀργόλαιοι *cod.*

⁽¹⁷⁾ Tout ce chapitre 3 correspond à SCHERMANN, p. 72-73.

4. Prière pour l'empereur.

Ταῦτα, θαυμάσιε καὶ μεγαλοπρεπέστατε προφήτα, τὰ σὰ προθεσπίσματα καὶ τὰ προτερήματα, αὕτη σου ἡ μαρτυρικὴ κοίμησις⁽¹⁸⁾ καὶ ἡ ἄθλησις. Διὸ καὶ ταῖς οὐρανίαις νῦν συνευφραϊνόμενος τάξειςιν, αἴτησαι δοθῆναι βασιλεῖ ἡμῶν τῷ ἀγγελωνύμῳ⁽¹⁹⁾ καὶ φιλαγίῳ

Μακρότητα ζωῆς καλλίστης καὶ ἀταράχου,
 Ἰσχὺν κατ' ἐχθρῶν αἰσθητῶν νοουμένων,
 Χαρὰν ἄληκτον καὶ δόξαν αἰωνίαν,
 ...⁽²⁰⁾
 Ἡλίου παιδοῦ τὴν ἀνέσπερον φαῦσιν,
 Λειμώνων τερπνῶν τὴν καλὴν μετουσίαν,
 Πάντων τῶν καλῶν ἀφθονωτάτην [col. 2] δόσιν

καὶ βασιλείας τὴν μέθεξιν τῆς ἄνω· ὅτι τῷ θεῷ ἡμῶν πρέπει ἡ δόξα καὶ τὸ κράτος νῦν καὶ ἀεὶ καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων, ἀμήν.

Notice sur saint Jérémie le prophète

1. Jérémie, l'illustre et grand prophète, qui fut sanctifié dès le sein de sa mère, était fils d'Helcias, un prêtre. Il habitait Anathom, dans la terre de Benjamin. La parole du Seigneur lui fut adressée à propos de la captivité de Jérusalem, comme quoi elle serait dévastée par le roi des Chaldéens. Quand il vit que la décision de Dieu était irrévocable, il composa sur ce sujet un thrène, comme on peut le trouver dans les Paralipomènes. Il fut emmené à Babylone avec le peuple et leur prophétisa leur retour. Ceux qui désiraient revoir la terre promise, il les exhortait à renoncer aux œuvres de Babylone, les hommes à quitter les femmes qu'ils y avaient épousées, les femmes à quitter les maris qu'elles y avaient pris. «Sinon, ajoutait-il, vous ne reverrez pas Jérusalem: parole du Seigneur». Beaucoup donc, tandis que s'organisait le départ, furent laissés à Babylone, soit des hommes qui disaient: «Nous ne quitterons pas nos épouses», soit des femmes qui disaient: «Ni nous nos maris». Les autres, après avoir traversé le Jourdain, arrivèrent à Jérusalem.

Alors donc Baruch et Abimélech, qui n'avaient pas accompagné le peuple emmené à Babylone, se tinrent avec Jérémie près de la porte de la ville (de Jérusalem) et dirent: «Quiconque a adopté les mœurs des Babyloniens n'entrera pas dans cette ville». Beaucoup donc retournèrent à Babylone. Comme on ne les y laissait pas entrer, ils revinrent sur leurs pas. Trouvant à une certaine distance de Jérusalem un endroit désert, ils y contruisirent une ville, s'y installèrent et lui donnèrent le nom de Samarie.

(18) Jérémie n'est pas seulement honoré comme un saint. Sa mort par lapidation le fait assimiler à un martyr.

(19) L'empereur Michel IV porte le nom de l'archange S. Michel.

(20) Il manque un «vers» commençant par A pour que l'acrostiche soit complet: ΜΙΧΑΗΛ Π.

2. Jérémie entra un jour en extase et y resta trois jours; on le croyait mort. Mais il éleva soudain la voix au milieu du peuple et s'écria: «Glorifiez tous Dieu et son fils unique qui doit nous réveiller. Dans 777 ans viendra sur terre l'arbre de vie qui avait été planté au milieu du paradis et il rendra fertiles tous les arbres stériles, ils prospéreront et donneront du fruit. Quant aux arbres fiers de leur fertilité et qui disent: 'Nous avons produit nos fruits à l'air libre', il les desséchera jusqu'aux plus hautes de leurs branches».

Comme Jérémie prophétisait ainsi au sujet du Christ, le peuple, rempli de colère, s'écria: «Voilà de nouveau les prophéties d'Isaïe fils d'Amos: 'J'ai vu Dieu et son fils'. Venez donc et, au lieu de le tuer comme Isaïe, ensevelissons-le sous les pierres».

Jérémie se présente donc, après avoir transmis les mystères à Baruch. Quand le peuple le vit, ils coururent à sa rencontre et l'ensevelirent sous un tas de pierres à Taphné en Égypte. Il repose dans la tombe du palais de Pharaon. Les Égyptiens lui rendirent hommage parce qu'ils avaient reçu de lui maints bienfaits, dont voici le récit. Les serpents qui infestaient la région périrent tous grâce à la prière du prophète. Quant aux fauves aquatiques que les Égyptiens appellent néphôt et les Grecs crocodiles, ils sortaient de l'eau et faisaient de grands ravages; mais par les prières de Jérémie ils périrent tous dans le Nil. On voit encore maintenant les fidèles de la région recueillir la poussière pour guérir les morsures des serpents, effrayer les crocodiles et causer leur mort. Quelques-uns parmi les fils d'Antigonos et de Ptolémée (les Grecs d'Égypte) affirment qu'ils ont entendu des vieillards bien informés raconter qu'Alexandre de Macédoine, venu sur la tombe de Jérémie et ayant pris connaissance de ses prophéties, fit transporter ses restes à Alexandrie et qu'il les enterra avec respect autour de la ville, ce qui fit disparaître les serpents du pays et les crocodiles du fleuve. On prétend aussi qu'Alexandre fit apporter des serpents d'Argos en Pélagonie et les jeta dans le Nil; d'où leur nom d'Argolai.

3. Ce prophète inspiré donna aussi aux prêtres égyptiens un signe: «Vos idoles seront ébranlées et s'écrouleront quand un enfant sauveur naîtra d'une vierge dans une crèche». C'est pourquoi jusqu'à maintenant ils considèrent comme dieu une vierge-mère et adorent un bébé mis dans une crèche. Comme le roi Ptolémée demandait une explication (de ce culte), on lui répondit: «C'est un usage traditionnel, enseigné à nos pères par un grand prophète. Et nous attendons la réalisation de ce mystère».

On raconte aussi sur ce grand prophète qu'avant la prise du Temple il enleva l'arche de la loi et son contenu et la fit déposer sous un rocher, en disant aux spectateurs: «Le Seigneur est parti du Sinaï pour le ciel. Il reviendra légiférer au Sinaï dans la puissance. Un signe de sa présence vous sera donné quand tous les peuples adoreront un bois». Et il ajouta: «Cette arche, personne ne la fera sortir (de sa cachette) si ce n'est le seul prêtre Aaron. Et les tables (de la Loi) qui s'y trouvent, personne ne les ouvrira plus, ni prêtre ni prophète, excepté Moïse l'élu de Dieu. A la résurrection (universelle), l'arche sera la première à se relever et à sortir; on la placera au mont Sinaï, et tous les saints se réuniront autour d'elle pour attendre le Seigneur et échapper à l'ennemi qui veut les faire périr».

Dans le rocher, il scella de son doigt le nom de Dieu. On aurait dit que le sceau était gravé par un instrument de fer. Et un nuage lumineux protégea le nom (ainsi gravé). Et personne ne pourra reconnaître l'endroit ni lire le nom jusqu'à ce jour-là. Le rocher est dans le désert à l'endroit où était l'arche entre les deux montagnes, près de la sépulture de Moïse et d'Aaron. Pendant la nuit, le nuage brille comme du feu à cet endroit suivant l'ancien modèle.

4. Voilà, admirable et glorieux prophète, tes prédictions et tes actions d'éclat; voilà quel fut ton martyr et ton dernier combat. Maintenant que tu partages la joie des armées célestes, demande que soit accordée à notre empereur au nom d'Ange (Michel), l'ami des saints, une vie longue, heureuse et sans révolutions, la force contre les ennemis terrestres et spirituels, une joie sans fin, une gloire éternelle, l'éclat sans déclin d'un brillant soleil, l'admission aux délicieux pâturages (de l'au-delà), l'abondance de tous les biens et une participation au royaume d'en-haut.

Car c'est à notre Dieu qu'appartient gloire et puissance maintenant et toujours et dans les siècles des siècles, amen.

Société des Bollandistes
24, boulevard Saint-Michel
B-1040 Bruxelles

F. HALKIN, S. J.

RECENSIONES

Vetus Testamentum

- E. Theodore MULLEN, Jr., *The Divine Council in Canaanite and Early Hebrew Literature* (Harvard Semitic Monographs 24). XII-327 p. 22,5 x 14,5. Chico, CA 1980. Scholars Press.

Yahweh presiding over an assembly of heavenly beings is a frequent picture in the OT. Jeremiah proclaims that the mark of an authentic prophet is to have stood in the council and to have heard Yahweh's decree. "Who has stood in the council of Yahweh, / has seen and heard his word, has heeded and obeyed his word?" (23,18). Deut 32,8-9, Isaiah 6 and 40, Psalms 29, 82, 89, 1 Kgs 22,19-23 are only some of the biblical passages which depict Yahweh issuing his decrees in the midst of the heavenly council.

The theme has often been noted, notably by H. W. Robinson in "The Council of Yahweh", *JTS* 45 (1944) 151-157, but has never, surprisingly, been made the object of a full scale inquiry despite the availability of rich comparative material from Mesopotamia and Ugarit.

Mullen's Harvard dissertation, done under F. M. Cross, is by far the most thorough study of the theme. The topic has long been of interest to Cross who wrote "The Council of Yahweh in Second Isaiah", *JNES* 12 (1953) 274-277, and to the latter's former Harvard colleague, Thorkild Jacobsen with his interest in primitive democracy in Mesopotamia. This intellectual lineage is evident throughout the book. There is however plenty of material for further research and plenty of problems for resolving. M. thoroughly and competently explores the evidence and comes to judicious conclusions. He does so concisely and clearly, making the reader forget that this is a dissertation.

Part I is devoted to the much controverted question of the relation of El and Baal in the Ugaritic texts. Several scholars, e.g. A. Kapelrud, U. Cassuto, M. Pope, and U. Oldenburg, believe that Baal has replaced El as head of the pantheon of Ugarit in the main texts — the Baal cycle, Danil and Kirta. M. argues strenuously against this view, based as much on analogies from Hesiod's *Theogony* and the Hurro-Hittite myths of Kumarbi as on the Ugaritic texts. The question is of some moment for his thesis since El presides over the Ugaritic *phr* (*bn*) *ilm*, *phr m'd*, *mphrt bn ilm* as Yahweh does over the 'ēdāt, dōr, mō'ēd, gāhāl, sōd in the Bible. M. concludes from a careful review of the Ugaritic and related evidence that El remains supreme over the gods, his status unaffected by the conflicts between Baal and Baal's enemies Yam and Mot over the rule of the cosmos. The reviewer concurs. El is the head of the pantheon; his decree assigns rulership in the world. At the same time one could wish the author appreciated the hellenistic elements in Philo of Byblos, as pointed out, for example, by H. W. Attridge and R. A. Oden,

Philo of Byblos: The Phoenician History (Washington 1981) 3-9, and not argued so strongly from it regarding early material. One must also question whether the rule of El was as absolute as M. claims. How free is El when the messengers of Yam demand the assembly hand over Baal in *CTA* 2.1 (= *UT* 137; *KTU* 1.2.I)? El elsewhere mourns the death of Baal (*CTA* 5.vi; *UT* 67.6; *KTU* 1.5.VI) and rejoices at his resurrection with the attendant revival of nature (*CTA* 6.3; *UT* 49.3; *KTU* 1.6.III). El's power is limited in the extant texts not by another god but by fate. As Y. Kaufmann wisely puts it, the fundamental idea of "pagan religion" is "that there exists a realm of being prior to the gods and above them, upon whom the gods depend, and whose decrees they must obey" (*The Religion of Israel*, transl. and abridged by M. Greenberg; London 1961) 21. There is no evidence that El wants the death of Baal and the withering of the world he created; he must here bow to ineluctable fate.

With the question of the presidency of the council in Ugaritic properly resolved, M. discusses the council itself, its members, its function, its meeting at El's tent dwelling and a number of related issues. He restates Cross's view, argued also by the reviewer, that the *'šhel mō'ēd* represents the tent of the deity, a reflection of the language of El. The discussion in this section deals in exemplary fashion with a host of issues: the council in Danil and Kirta (slightly different from the Baal cycle); Psalm 82 as a judgment scene; the evidence from the liturgical texts. A promising avenue of research is opened up by the author on pp. 209-226 where he extends H. W. Robinson's view that the prophet is the herald of the divine assembly. M. cites a number of biblical passages, Isa 40,1-8; Jer 23,18.22a; Amos 3,7; 1 Kgs 22,19-23 to show that the prophet is a herald of what he sees and hears in the council. Much more research is needed before one can claim that herald of the council is *the* paradigm for the Hebrew prophet, but it is undeniable that some texts support the idea.

This fine book makes accessible to Ugaritic specialists and biblical scholars alike an extremely important theme of ancient literature.

Weston School of Theology
Cambridge, MA 02138
U.S.A.

Richard J. CLIFFORD

Jean KOENIG, *L'Herméneutique analogique du Judaïsme antique d'après les témoins textuels d'Isaïe* (Supplements to Vetus Testamentum XXXIII). xvii-450 p. Leiden 1982. E. J. Brill. Gld. 140.

As far as its textual basis is concerned, this book deals with two witnesses only, viz., the LXX of Isaiah and 1QIs^a. On the other hand, the

methodological conclusions and reflections are very wide in scope as becomes clear from the title: "L'Herméneutique analogique du Judaïsme antique". The limited area of investigation should therefore be taken into consideration when the correctness of the conclusions is examined. A second point which should be taken into consideration is that there are many more "témoins textuels" of Isaiah than the ones examined. For the technique described is known from all textual witnesses of Isaiah which could have been discussed here as well: Peshitta (or did not the author consider this translation Jewish?), Targumim (extensively), Qumran scrolls other than IQIs^a (indeed, the author explains the technique for IQIs^a by an example from 4QIs^b [pp. 202-203]). In addition, the pesharim from Qumran as well as combinations of quotations from Isaiah in various ancient sources (Qumran writings, Talmud) would have provided the necessary background for the technique analyzed here. Last, but not least, the same technique is actually also known for MT itself, cf. the recent article by Y. Zakovitch, "Hyperassimilation in Biblical Narratives", in J. H. Tigay, ed., *Empirical Models for the Development of the Hebrew Bible* (in press).

The technique described in the present book was known also before Koenig, but it is treated here at great length (450 pp.), and with better understanding of the issues involved (one of the keywords in Koenig's analysis is the "méconnaissance" by previous scholars of the issues under investigation). The technique discussed, "herméneutique analogique", is actually not defined in the beginning of the book, but some partial definitions are provided in the course of the discussion, on pp. 30 ff. for the LXX; pp. 201 ff. for IQIs^a; and pp. 379 ff. in general. The author reaches these definitions after an analysis of previous approaches to the LXX of Isaiah (Zillesen, Ottley, Ziegler, Seeligmann). Two different techniques are recognized, "emprunts scripturaires" (scriptural borrowings) and "analogies verbales" (verbal analogies). Although the author does not say so, these techniques are named by others as "harmonization" and "assimilation".

According to the author, the many scriptural borrowings in the LXX of Isaiah (pp. 3-103) resulted from a systematic study of Scripture practiced in the period (cf. especially the rabbinical rules of exegesis), not merely from occasional reminiscences. These borrowings consist mainly of textual pluses. The background of the translator's technique is the rabbinic *g'zerah shavah* which relates two or more texts to each other when the combination of the texts is called for by either its content or the use of similar words (pp. 52 ff.). This system should be seen within a certain religious framework, as it presupposes the binding force and inspiration of some verses in the Bible exerted on other ones. If the true scope of scriptural borrowings is recognized, one should ascribe them as much as possible to the original translator, and not to the subsequent textual transmission, as has been done often in previous generations, also by Ziegler. Ziegler's edition sometimes presented a late-Hexaplaric-text form as the main text, while the original translation actually included a "scriptural borrowing", relegated by Ziegler to the apparatus (pp. 69-83). A topic which is discussed at some length is the influence of the Greek text of Gen 11 (tower of Babylon) on that of the LXX of Isa 9,10(9) (pp. 87-103). Further examples are the plus in Isa 48,21 deriving

from Exod 17,6 (pp. 70-74), the plus in Isa 29,24 deriving from 32,4 (pp. 74-79), as well as several others.

The second part of the first section (pp. 127-198) deals with "variations par analogies verbales formelles dans G Is". It has no introduction, so that the exact difference between the two categories is not spelled out. The general principle, however, is clear, although there remain doubts with regard to details. While the textual borrowings (part I) refer mainly to textual pluses, part II deals with formulations by the translator which were influenced by other parts of the translation, either in the same book or in other books, e.g., the translation of Isa 8,14, influenced by that of Exod 9,14 (pp. 125-135), the translation of *l'umim* by *archontes* in 34,1; 41,1; 43,4,9 on the basis of the LXX of Gen 27,29. We deal here, claims Koenig, not with isolated cases of exegesis, but with an exegetical method, by which texts influence each other.

The last chapter of the first section of the book explains why the analysis of the LXX should be continued with that of the Hebrew sources. Thus the next — second — section analyzes 1QIs^a along the same lines as the LXX. Textual borrowings, consisting of pluses, are analyzed in the first part of this section (pp. 201-291), such as the plus in Isa 1,7 1QIs^a according to Lev 26,32, and the one in Isa 1,15 1QIs^a according to 59,3. The second part treats verbal analogies in 1QIs^a (pp. 295-376), e.g., *hšmn* in Isa 6,10, altered in 1QIs^a to *hšm* on the basis of Ezek 20,26 (and other texts).

The last part of section II discusses the background and implications of the so-called method of analogy (pp. 379-450). The method of scriptural analogies developed within Judaism, without foreign influences (p. 379). On the other hand, the system of verbal analogies developed under the influence of the Babylonian world of the second millennium B.C.E. This idea is developed at great length (pp. 383-404).

This reviewer has mixed feelings about the book. It is very learned, very elaborate, and provides a great amount of data and information. The passages treated in the book are discussed at great length, and since the book contains indexes, one has access to good and thorough discussions of passages containing possible borrowings or verbal analogies, by other scholars named harmonizing tendencies. Most of the author's conclusions on these passages are correct as far as the recognition of the analogy is concerned. But this aspect is not at stake, since these connections have been recognized in the past by others. What is at stake are the general conclusions which Koenig draws from these passages. Koenig does not speak about a tendency, but a system, so that sound evidence is required. The conclusions go much beyond Isaiah, and even in that book he did not study the textual witnesses beyond the LXX and 1QIs^a. Indeed, Koenig refers to Judaism in general and his conclusions are very far-reaching with regard to the background of the "system". Indeed, there is a continuous tension between the data and the conclusions. In order to accept generalizing conclusions, the reader needs much more background information, which is not provided here, and which is, in fact, difficult in itself because of the subjective nature of the analysis. One would like to know first of all whether the book contains all cases of possible borrowing and verbal analogies in the sources analyzed and also

whether these borrowings recur in other textual witnesses. What is the situation in the Peshitta, Vulgate, Targumim and in the other Qumran writings? Only after these data are known some background information is available for a general theory referring to Isaiah only. However, no overall theory is possible if one lacks information with regard to other biblical books, and in the absence of such information we can speak only of tendencies.

When reviewing all the known textual witnesses, and when speaking in very general terms only, I think that Koenig has indeed chosen the two witnesses which more than others reflect a tendency to assimilate verses to other ones. It is not impossible that this tendency is connected with rabbinic techniques, but at the same time several of the assimilations may have been created by regular scribal activity, sometimes intended, at other times not. At the same time, it should be remembered that textual assimilations in the LXX and 1QIs^a have to be linked with the character of these documents, which have indeed something in common in their approach. Both approached their base text very freely, inserting pluses, minuses, minor changes, grammatical and stylistic harmonizations, and in the LXX also free word choices. Within the free approach of these sources it is feasible that there occur also a number of assimilations—it still has to be determined how numerous they are and in the case of the LXX whether Ziegler or Koenig is right with regard to the textual transmission. The free approach of 1QIs^a and the Greek translator allowed them to add—not always consciously—references to other verses, and this tendency is as much part of the nature of these two sources as it is of the exegetical systems described by Koenig.

In summary, the reader will find the extensive discussions of the passages (which comprise the greater part of the book) very inspiring and helpful, but Koenig's general conclusions leave many open questions.

Hebrew University
Jerusalem

Emanuel Tov

Anneli AEJMELAEUS, *Parataxis in the Septuagint. A Study of the Renderings of the Hebrew Coordinate Clauses in the Greek Pentateuch* (Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae, Dissertationes Humanarum Litterarum 31). vi+198 p. Helsinki 1982. Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia.

Anneli Aejmelaesus has had the excellent idea of presenting in her doctoral dissertation a thorough and exhaustive study of the renderings of the Hebrew coordinate clauses in the Greek Pentateuch in order to discover how the Septuagint translators dealt with the phenomenon of Hebrew parataxis. The paratactic surface form (for what on a deeper level should be considered as a relationship of subordination) of course also exists in Greek, and in this

field the author could avail herself of such studies as Trenkner's treatment of the *KAI* style in Greek, starting from Attic prose and ending with modern Greek. Further, methodically speaking, free renderings are treated in a rather exhaustive way in spite of their relative infrequency, since it is only through such a treatment that certain translation techniques can be isolated and described.

It is hardly a surprise to discover that Hebrew *waw* has been rather consistently rendered with Greek *KAI* (76,3 % of all *waw* clauses). This is even true in cases where the logical relationship between two coordinate clauses is an adversative one, where a coordinate clause expresses a consequence or a purpose, a reason or a concession, and in cases where the first clause of a coordinate pair provides the setting of the second one. It is through the accumulative factor only that parataxis by *KAI* can be called a stylistic hebraism. This becomes clear from a simple comparison between the Pentateuch on the one hand, and an original Greek writing such as 2 Macc on the other. In the Hebrew text of the former 56 % of all clauses are paratactic and in its Greek translation 44 %. In the latter, however, the figure is 17%, and even that figure is the highest one of all comparable Koine texts!

The most important alternative to *KAI* is, of course, *ΔΕ* which is used as an equivalent especially in Gen and Exod. Nevertheless, Gen has 16 % *ΔΕ* clauses over against 39 % *KAI* clauses and the figures for Exod are 9 and 41 respectively, whereas Martin on the base of an analysis of his text samples concludes that in original Greek writings *ΔΕ* clauses occur at least twice as often as *KAI* clauses.

However, another coordinate conjunction sometimes used is *ΟΥΝ* and such a usage is a clear indication that the translator "is striving towards natural Koine usage" (59). The statistics of *ΟΥΝ* signalize again the translators of Gen and Exod. It also happens that original coordinate clauses are transformed into final clauses in Greek, in 42 instances introduced by *ΙΝΑ* and in 5 cases by *ΟΤΙ*. In most of these occurrences the preceding main clause expresses either a wish or a command. On 18 occasions transformation into relative clauses has taken place, but this phenomenon is almost entirely limited to Gen. The 14 instances witnessing to a conditional rendering of a coordinate clause, introduced by *ΕΙ* or *ΕΑΝ*, are particularly revealing as to the translators's skill. The same cannot be said of the 228 occurrences of asyndetic clauses in the Greek Pentateuch since asyndeton is not a popular device in Greek. On the other hand, the 451 instances in which a coordinate clause has been rendered by a *participium coniunctum* in Greek (4,9 % of the translated *waw* clauses) provide an important criterion for determining a certain translation technique. Although it should be observed that the frequency is that of one case for each 15-20 clauses (Gen ranking highest), whereas certain selections of Koine texts show a frequency of one instance for each 2-10 clauses. Far less common is another idiomatic Greek device: the *genitivus absolutus* which occurs only 14 times. The lack of a formally corresponding expression in Hebrew has apparently caused such a low frequency. More difficult to judge are the 148 instances in which a Hebrew coordinate clause has no equivalent in Greek. Remarkably, 74 of the 83 cases in Exod are found in chapters 37-40. Since such factors as difference in *Vorlage* and

accidents in copying of manuscripts may largely be responsible for such zero renderings, the author rightly did not take into account these instances, preventing thus a falsification of the overall statistics.

This study leads to several conclusions. First of all, in terms of frequency, only *KAI*, *AE* and the *part. coni.* have a ratio worth mentioning. Secondly, from a viewpoint of translation technique the Greek Pentateuch clearly consists of two different sections: Gen-Exod on the one hand, and Lev-Num-Deut on the other. A real accumulation of free renderings is to be found in narration, especially in Exod 2; Gen 25; 37; 42-44; 46 and in Num 21; 22-24 which shows that the text type plays an important part. As to some features such as the non-rendering of the apodotic *waw*, implying the ability of the translator to handle larger discourse units, Exod shows the greatest skill. Thirdly, a change in translation technique can be discovered: a movement away from functional towards formal translation. Finally, the evidence of this study does not appear to be in favour of any theory of bisection of the books of the Pentateuch.

The main weaknesses of this thesis are in the domains of semantics and translation theory. So the author speaks at several occasions of the inability of *KAI* to carry independent meanings (14, 16, 34) and she states: "A coordinator like *KAI* is not capable of conveying any meaning independent of the context, let alone entirely different meanings at different times" (14). However, no word has a meaning independent of its context. Even the so-called "unmarked" meaning of a word (a concept the author should have employed regularly) depends upon a majority of contexts of a language. And most words have entirely different meanings at different times. Why should the highly generic *KAI* be an exception? A clearer insight in this field would have prevented the extremely confused discussion of *AE* (34-36) in which it is first stated that what applies to *KAI* does not apply to *AE*, whereas it is finally observed that what applies to *KAI* does apply to *AE* (if the present writer is allowed to spell out in this way the implicit relationships of the discourse by the author!).

Also certain insights regarding the theory and practice of translation can be criticized. Contrary to what the author suggests, *EXEIN*, *OPAN* and a temporal adverb should not be considered as translations of Hebrew *hinneh* (26-27). In view of the verbless Hebrew sentence the translators simply had to supply a verb in Greek. It may be difficult to discover the "logic with *ΓAP*" in the case of Exod 5,18 (64), it becomes even more difficult if the author does not provide the reader with the larger context. Moreover, *ΓAP* may very well have the function of confirming or strengthening something which has been said, especially in the wider context of Exod 5,18. It is apparently wrong to state that the Greek *part. coni.* *AABΩN* as a rendering of Hebrew *lāqah* is a pleonastic participle in the case of Gen 37,24 (91). In fact, the verbal form introduces both in Hebrew and in Greek a new event. In the same way, the combination of the Hebrew verbs *qādad* and *shāhāh* and the rendering of both verbs in the Greek text of Exod 12,27 should not be considered as pleonastic (94), since the first verb expresses a modal aspect. Further, such pejorative expressions as "intrusive words" in the wording of the discussion on the Greek Lev (150) should have been avoided. The ques-

tion should have been asked why the Greek translator of Lev 21,9 renders "defiles her father" with "defiles *the name of* her father". The answer most probably is that the Greek verb *ΒΕΒΗΛΟΩ* normally takes an inanimate object so that one faces a translational necessity in view of the receptor language.

These criticisms, however, mainly concern matters of minor detail. As a whole, this is a very valuable study considerably advancing Septuagint research in a hitherto insufficiently explored area.

32 rue de la Souffel
67370 Griesheim sur Souffel
France

Jan DE WAARD

Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament. In Verbindung mit G. W. ANDERSON, H. CAZELLES, D. N. FREEDMAN, S. TALMON und G. WALLIS herausgegeben von G. J. BOTTERWECK und H. RINGGREN. Band III: יתר - חמר. Stuttgart-Berlin-Köln-Mainz 1982. Verlag W. Kohlhammer, XIV-547-568 p. e cc. 1090, rilegato.

Questo terzo volume del *Theologisches Wörterbuch* appare con un certo ritardo nei confronti dei precedenti: là il tempo impiegato tra l'uscita del primo fascicolo ed il completamento del volume è stato di circa tre anni, questa volta ce ne sono voluti cinque. Speriamo che sia solo un rallentamento contingente: ci troviamo infatti praticamente alla metà dell'opera e sarebbe bello averla completa in nove invece che in quindici anni.

Anche questo volume conferma una delle caratteristiche più affascinanti dell'opera: il suo carattere internazionale ed ecumenico. Le voci spaziano attraverso l'Europa e l'America settentrionale e naturalmente Israele; tra le confessioni religiose rappresentate troviamo cattolici, protestanti, avventisti ed ebrei, per menzionarne solo alcune. Purtroppo alcuni difetti dell'opera non sono stati corretti, il più vistoso dei quali è la citazione di opere non tedesche nella traduzione tedesca soltanto. Caso tipico è quello di R. de Vaux, *Les institutions de l'Ancien Testament* (Paris, I, 1958; II, 1959). Al lettore che possieda l'originale, che utilità potrà mai dare il riferimento costante o quasi alle *Lebensordnungen*? Senza pensare che il sistema finisce per dare al lettore un'impressione di provincialismo che male si concilia col sullodato carattere internazionale ed ecumenico dell'opera. Né può trattarsi di una questione di spazio, come mi è stato privatamente suggerito: tra una voce e l'altra vi sono spazi bianchi piuttosto ampi, tipograficamente ed esteticamente inutili per non dire controproducenti, che avrebbero potuto servire bene alla bisogna; e la cosa non avrebbe certo aggravato l'opera degli autori, i quali in ogni caso dovevano controllare sull'originale l'attendibilità della traduzione tedesca, per cui citare anche l'originale sarebbe stata la cosa più semplice.

La qualità delle voci è sempre notevole, anche se vi sono variazioni da autore ad autore. Mi piace citare le seguenti voci, sperando di non far torto a nessuno per omissione: *hnp*, *hesed*, *hopšî*, *hrm*, *yd'*, *y'hûdâh*. Qua e là è possibile, e del resto da aspettarsi, trovare elementi dubbi: alla c. 24, sotto *hnn*, è pertinente l'accostamento al latino *gratia*, quando la radice indica «ringraziamento»? In latino, contrariamente all'italiano e allo spagnolo, tale significato è secondario. O alle cc. 202 s., sotto *hrm*, dopo aver segnalato giustamente il carattere improprio di una traduzione con «interdetto» (*Bann*), un significato che il termine acquista solo nel Medio Evo, sembra difficilmente accettabile la tesi secondo la quale l'attestazione, nell'iscrizione di Meša' di Mo'ab, dello schema della guerra santa sia un argomento contro l'attribuzione dell'istituto in Israele al Dtr.: l'autore stesso segnala poco oltre (c. 202) che manca in Israele ogni fonte atta a localizzare l'istituto in un qualche periodo della sua storia. Alla c. 274 vi è poi una grossa omissione nel testo (quasi una colonna), corretta, è vero, alla p. 566, ma senza che venga chiaramente indicato quale parte nel testo vada cancellata e sostituita; è un caso nel quale bisognava ristampare il quinterno ed assumersi il corrispondente onere finanziario. Alla c. 495, sotto *yd'*, sembrerebbe ovvio doversi dare la preferenza, in Gen. 2,9.17, alla tesi che vede nell'espressione «bene e male» un merismo, indicante dunque totalità, ma l'autore non prende posizione. Alla c. 534, sotto *ywhh*, mi sembra molto più semplice spiegare lo *shewa* della vocalizzazione *y'hōwāh* come prodotto dall'assenza della gutturale, la quale spiega invece il *hātef* in *'dōnay*, invece di parlare di possibili violazioni di un *tabu* (dato e non concesso che il divieto di pronunciare il Nome divino possa essere compreso sotto questa categoria storico-religiosa). Più grave è che l'autore non ci parli che in maniera insufficiente del nome attribuito a divinità indipendenti da Israele (c. 543 ss., cfr. recentemente G. Garbini, «Attestazioni epigrafiche su Jahvé e Jahvismo», *RiBib* 28 [1980], 79-88, un articolo che l'autore non poteva ancora aver visto) e della problematica teologica che ne scaturisce: si vedano i nomi *yawbidi* a Hamat, *yawi-ilu* a Mari e *yaw* ad Ugarit, per menzionarne solo alcuni. Infine alla c. 659, lin. 15 d.b. leggasi Jael per Sisera.

L'opera si raccomanda in ogni caso senza riserve, come importante contributo alla filologia ed alla teologia dell'Antico Testamento.

Via Pietro Cossa, 42
00193 Roma

J. A. SOGGIN

Homer HEATER, Jr., *A Septuagint Translation Technique in the Book of Job* (The Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series 11). Washington 1982.

The Septuagint of the Book of Job is compounded of two strata which are entirely different: (a) The old Greek (OG) which is a loose translation of the Hebrew text, written in idiomatic Greek. This translation is much short-

er than MT. Origen notes that in many passages several lines which appear in the Hebrew text are absent from the Greek (some 350 lines or about one sixth); (b) A later translation has been interwoven, designed to complete the lacunae, though in some cases inserted not in the appropriate places. In contrast to the OG, this one is quite literal.

Eusebius ascribes to Origen the practice of completing the Greek column of his Hexapla by taking from the translation of Theodotion and earmarking those insertions with asterisks and *metabolus*. In the Book of Job those Hexaplaric symbols have been preserved in two Greek MSS as well as in MSS of translations from the LXX such as the Vetus Latina and the Syro-Hexapla; on the other hand, the Copto-Sahidic translation does not include the Theodotonic passages. Thus the text of the OG can easily be discriminated from the "New Greek".

Whereas the later stratus, being almost literal, does not give rise to problems (Heater, in a former work, has shown that it has features of the *Kaige* Recension, as characterized by Barthélemy in *Les Devanciers d'Aquila*), the OG of Job is quite problematic. Besides its brevity (scholarly opinion differs on whether this is due to a shorter, perhaps original, Hebrew text), the many differences between it and the Massoretic text (MT) need to be explained. Frequently we find a phrase or idea in the translation whose relationship to MT is inexplicable. There are equally differences in structure, such as a single colon, where the Hebrew has two cola, omissions of entire cola, or the addition of a colon. We also find changes of metaphors, and sometimes even changes in the whole content of the Hebrew phrases.

Different explanations have been suggested for these differences. Some have claimed that the translator worked with a different text. Other scholars — such as Gerleman, Gehman, and Gard — have tried to prove that theological bias influenced the translator to deviate from the Hebrew text. This view has already been rejected. Some differences have been explained on a stylistic basis.

In this volume, Heater analyzes the translation technique of the OG translator which he calls "the anaphoric translation". This is the technique of adapting words or phrases from elsewhere in the Septuagint — mostly from Job — where the same or similar ideas are to be found. Two examples from Heater's book follow:

- (a) 2,10 את הטוב נקבל מאת האלהים ואת הרע לא נקבל
 εἰ τὰ ἀγαθὰ ἐδοξάμεν ἐκ χειρὸς Κυρίου τὰ κακὰ οὐχ ὑποίσομεν;

The idea of receiving calamities *from the hand of God* has clearly been influenced by *חַי לִקְחָה מִיָּד* in Isa 40,2, rendered *ὅτι ἐδέξατο ἐκ χειρὸς Κυρίου*. The context in both cases contains the motif of comfort: *נַחֲמוּ נַחֲמוּ עָמִי* in Isa 40,1; Job's friends come to comfort him (*לִנְחֹמוֹ*; 2,11). The influence of the passage from Isaiah also explains the shift from the Divine name *אלהים* to *Κύριος* (*ה'*).

- (b) 3,16 או כנפל טמן לא אהיה
 ἢ ὥσπερ ἔκτρομα ἐκπορεύομενον ἐκ μήτρας μητρὸς

Scholars have explained this rendition as a paraphrase; others have argued that it represents a different text. However, they did not notice the use of an image from Num 12,12.

The main section of the book (pp. 11-131) is a presentation of all the places in Job where the translation differs from the MT. *Ad hoc* explanations were offered in the past for these deviations. But Heater claims they can be accounted for parsimoniously by the principle of anaphoric translation. The author offers an impressive list of 113 cases where this is the technique of the translator. About three quarters of the sources of influence are from Job itself (144 verses) and the rest (67 verses) are taken from other biblical books, mainly from Isaiah and the Torah. In some of the instances this technique is not prominent, but in most of them it is quite apparent.

It has already been known that the possibility of using Septuagint Job to emend the MT is very limited (see for example the apparatus of *BHS* in contrast to *BHK*). The author concludes that the Vorlage of the Septuagint translator was not much different from MT, and almost all the divergences can be explained as intentional on the part of the translator. In his conclusion, Heater cites a long list of cases in the Job Septuagint which used to be explained as due to a different text but needn't be so explained. If it is necessary to emend the Hebrew text this can't be done on the basis of the LXX since the divergences of the latter are due to anaphoric translation.

A short chapter is devoted to surmises why the translator adopted this procedure. Heater offers four possible explanations:

- a. "Failure to understand the Hebrew".
- b. "Desire to develop a homily". E.g., דרך mentioned in the text in a non-theological sense ("route", "road") becomes in his rendition "the just way".
- c. "Problems with the Hebrew text" (the author considers this as additional to (a) though the differences between them are not so clear).
- d. "Desire to harmonize".

The basis of this book is a dissertation of 1976. Carefully and diligently, Heater has examined every case and presented all the alternative explanations as well as arguing for what he considers the most satisfactory.

Two remarks seem to be in order:

(a) For the convenience of the reader, Heater usually prints in parallel columns the texts of MT and LXX and underneath them the English translations. The English translation can sometimes prove misleading: since it is intended to convey the *exact* meaning of the Hebrew text as we now understand it in the light of our knowledge of biblical Hebrew, but not as the Greek translator understood it; thus it follows that where the Greek translates very literally, according to his understanding, the English translation conveys the impression there *were* differences between MT and LXX. E.g., p. 12, the English translation of Gen 48,16 and of 1 Sam 10,19.

(b) Frequently the author adopts a polemical stance which is quite unnecessary. The facts and arguments should be allowed to speak for themselves.

There is no doubt that this is a very important book not only for understanding the LXX of Job but also for comprehending the LXX and for research on the versions of the Bible generally.

Bar-Ilan University
Ramat-Gan, Israel

Moshe A. ZIPOR

Novum Testamentum

Frank J. MATERA, *The Kingship of Jesus. Composition and Theology in Mark 15* (Society of Biblical Literature, Dissertation Series, 66). x-222 p. 21,5 × 13,5. Chico, California 1982. Scholars Press. \$12.75.

This 1981 Th.D. dissertation from Union Theological Seminary in Richmond, Virginia (advisor: Paul J. Achtemeier) begins well. In fact, the reviewer had a hard time putting it down, even though its first chapters consist in rather detailed redaction analysis of Mk 15. Matera writes simply and clearly. By the nature of things such analysis can rarely get out of the realm of the plausible, but Matera weaves together so many plausible arguments that he seems to transcend the genre in which he is writing and the reviewer felt that he was in touch with Mark at a deep level. Matera contends that Mark composed Chapter 15 around the motif of kingship (cf. p. 63). He presents a good case.

From the vantage point of his analysis of Mk 15 Matera then asks two questions: "First, in what sense did Mark understand Jesus' kingship? Second, how does he manifest this in the rest of the gospel?" (p. 63). And here, unfortunately, the dissertation begins to break down. The difficulty Matera faces is the fact that Mark does not use the word "king" with reference to Jesus except in Chapter 15 where it is found six times, all of which are on the lips of Jesus' opponents (p. 64).

Matera attempts to handle the problem by studying the theme of kingship as seen in the theme of David's kingship and the theme of the temple (Mark 11-12), by studying Jesus as the Son of Man in relation to John the Baptist (Mark 10,33-34 and 6,14-29), and by studying several themes connected with the death of Jesus in Mark 15 (e.g., Ps 22, the Elijah mockery, the tearing of the temple curtain, the centurion's confession).

The disparate nature of the material from which Matera tries to tease forth a coherent Markan view of kingship is self-condemnatory: if Mark was so careful to compose Chapter 15 around the theme of kingship, why was he so coy about handling this theme in his Gospel before Chapter 15, presuming that he did handle it? Not that Matera doesn't have worthwhile insights here and there (the use of Ps 22 in Mark 15 is particularly well done). But

he simply doesn't measure up to his opening chapters. He never makes clear (at least to the reviewer) why he doesn't examine the theme of "kingdom" in the early chapters of Mark: if Jesus is king, would it not be plausible that he have a kingdom? The phrase "kingdom of God" in Mark is found some fourteen times in the fourteen chapters preceding Chapter 15, where it is found once. This would seem to be the artfully woven theme which matches the artfully woven theme of "Jesus king" in Mark 15. (And, of course, one has to be alert to the possibility that the theme of kingdom is present even when the word is not — cf. *Bib* 64 [1983] 141-142). The themes of Jesus' kingship and God's kingdom probably come together in the crucifixion where Jesus enters into his kingdom and in so doing reveals that his kingdom is not of this world and cannot be recognized by persons who are of the world. Here is the real answer to Matera's first question about the nature of Jesus' kingship in Mark. And Mark manifests it in the rest of his Gospel by preparing the reader for the manifestation of Jesus' kingdom at the crucifixion where it is inferred from the use of Ps 22 by the reader who has such preparation. This is the answer to Matera's second question.

Matera seems to be on the right track when he links the eschatological kingship of Jesus in Mark with the kingdom in Daniel (cf. pp. 108-110), but his linking of the "Son of Man" title with Jesus as king is not well advised: Jesus as king is linked with Jesus as messiah, and Jesus as messiah and Jesus as Son of Man are two distinct themes (cf. *Bib* 64 [1983] 143). But Matera's linking of the centurion's confession with Jesus' kingship seems to be a happier choice (cf. pp. 135-137).

The reviewer hopes that Matera keeps up his interest in Jesus as king and that he eventually gives the readers of his dissertation a revised version in which the brilliance of the first four chapters is matched in the rest of the book.

Pontifical Biblical Institute
Via della Pilotta, 25
00187 Rome

James SWETNAM, S. J.

J. Duncan M. DERRETT, *The Anastasis: The Resurrection of Jesus as an Historical Event*. XIV-166 p. 22,5 × 20. Shipston-on-Stour, Warwickshire 1982. P. Drinkwater. £ 5.00.

An interesting and instructive *Fehlschlag*, this. Derrett is convinced that the *anastasis* of Jesus was a reality independent of the subjective attitudes of the circle of the first disciples (this in contrast with much of contemporary opinion — cf. pp. 14-17). This objective *anastasis* consisted in the resuscitation of Jesus in the tomb (pp. 47-67). After a brief period of post-*anastasis* activity Jesus really died and his body was cremated (pp. 80-86). Thus, in substance, Derrett.

This brief summary does not do justice to the wealth of argumentation adduced. For example, considerable discussion is given to the existence of *anastasis* in the sense of revival after apparent death, both in antiquity and in the modern world (pp. 19-45). Derrett is never dull and what he says is almost always instructive in one way or another.

As an example of Derrett's capacity of insight-into-text and his ability to phrase his insight accordingly the following observation about the Second Gospel may serve:

Mark is a historian steeped in theology. Consequently many factual details are given to us not because they are facts but because of the load of implications under which we find them labouring — seen, of course, with the eye of faith. (p. 7)

There follows a series of stimulating suggestions (pp. 7-10).

Felicitous also is Derrett's view that Mark's Gospel ended at 16,8:

It is now established that a gospel can indeed end on the particle, γάρ, 'for'! It is already realised that the women's 'fear', the absolute climax of Mark's gospel (in which *awe* still dominates the undomesticated message), is the correct proof of the presence of the numinous. (p. 135)

Derrett relies heavily on the sacrifice of Isaac by Abraham in Gen 22 — the Aqedah — as background for the sacrificial destiny of Jesus. There are nineteen entries in the index under the titles "Isaac, life of", "sacrifice of", and "myth and legend of". Perhaps the most original suggestion in this regard is made by Derrett on p. 83, where he links the words of Jesus to Peter at Mark 8,33 ("Get behind me, Satan...") with the Jewish midrashic tradition about Satan's trying to interfere with the sacrifice of Isaac. This is a suggestion well worth following up.

One source of considerable disappointment for the reviewer occurs on p. 121. There Derrett sets forth some opinions about the title "Son of man" which seem basically sound:

Though many scholars think that 'Son of man' was a title foisted on Jesus later, 'Son of man' (Ps. 8:4) was Jesus's name for himself. It is interesting that Isaac was also Son of man.^{9a} (p. 121).

But, alas, there is no note 9a on p. 129 corresponding to the reference given on p. 121, where it should be found. To the reviewer, who has spent much time mulling over the relation of Jesus to the Aqedah, this is another suggestion well worth following up. Derrett owes his fans an article or book with no footnotes omitted.

But a *Fehlschlag* nonetheless. Derrett's "conjecture" (cf. p. 85) demands that Jesus, taken down from the cross and laid in the tomb in a state of profound weakness, revive in the tomb, emerge, and go through at least some of the motions recorded in the gospels before finally dying and being cremated. Significantly, in a book where analysis of the most minute details abounds (cf. the discussion on bone-packing in ossuaries, pp. 58-59), no dis-

cussion is given to the way in which such a seriously debilitated man could open up a tomb from within when the closing stone was in place. (The genre of "escape story" from tombs is explored, but unfortunately, as Derrett himself acknowledges [p. 60], the examples given in a recent study are all distinguishable from the escape of Jesus). It seems that the report at Matt 27,62-66 according to which the Jewish authorities had the tomb made secure and sealed in the company of the guard is just a comical anecdote, at the most expressing the fact that the tomb was guarded (pp. 59-60). But the suggestion that Joseph of Arimathea was an entirely imaginary character is "ridiculous" and "illustrates how deep is ignorance on the subject" (p. 59). Our theorizing doth make eclectics of us all.

But supposing that Jesus was able to escape from the closed tomb in a terribly weakened state, and supposing also that he was able to move among his joyous disciples without leaving any positive record in the sources about their wonder at this weakened state, there is a further formidable hurdle. The cremation takes place, but none of the disciples, who effected it, ever gave any indication of what they had done even when contrary traditions were in force. Even on the supposition of some benefit to accrue to the disciples, this conspiracy theory seems implausible. It is like pleading for the acceptance of a major change in the accepted text of the New Testament with no known manuscripts to support one's position. Worse is coming to worse.

What Derrett does succeed in doing in his "conjecture" (cf. pp. 96-97) is to frame the whole conundrum of the resurrection of Jesus freshly anew. On p. 130 he states a basic premise:

Since Jesus was a man, whose life and work even as depicted in the gospels was that of a recognisable human innovator and entrepreneur, we cannot entertain seriously any question of his materialising and dematerialising, whatever those words can be taken to mean.

That is to say, any explanation of what happened has to be in terms of what has happened elsewhere and elsewhere in human history: the categories of human experience are absolute and ineluctable. But this, of course, is to commit oneself to the rather dubious principle that rules never have exceptions. That the resurrection of Jesus was a unique exception in the history of mankind is a tenet of Christian faith, susceptible to no explanation in human categories which by definition do not deal with exceptions.

For the reviewer, at least, Derrett's book has made this Christian faith in the exception that was Jesus' *anastasis* more plausible than ever. Jesus' *anastasis* not as resurrection from the living but Jesus' *anastasis* as resurrection from the dead. No *Fehlschlag* that.

Pont. Biblical Institute
Via della Pilotta, 25
00187 Rome

James SWETNAM

J. MATEOS, *Los "Doce" y otros seguidores de Jesús en el Evangelio de Marcos* (Lectura del Nuevo Testamento. Estudios críticos y exegéticos 1). 304 p. Madrid 1982. Ediciones Cristiandad.

In der Arbeit wird unter 710 Nummern die These vertreten, daß es bei Markus unter den Nachfolgern Jesu zwei streng voneinander geschiedene Gruppen gibt. Die eine Gruppe stellen die Zwölf dar, mit denen die häufig genannten Jünger identisch sind. Sie kommen aus dem institutionellen Israel und werden von Jesus berufen und eingesetzt als das neue und endgültige, messianische Israel. Das Bemühen Jesu um diese Gruppe endet in einem völligen Fehlschlag. Sie sind nicht bereit die Unterweisungen Jesu zu verstehen und anzunehmen. Sie halten an ihrem nationalistisch verengten, politischen Messiasverständnis bis zuletzt fest. Für die Gruppe ist es symptomatisch, wie der Erste und Letzte in ihrer Liste handelt: Petrus leugnet dreimal, Jesus zu kennen; Judas verrät ihn. Die Gruppe nimmt den Ruf des Auferstandenen nach Galiläa nicht an; sie weigert sich, die Botschaft Jesu zu allen Völkern zu tragen, und bekennt sich weiterhin zur Lehre der Schriftgelehrten, zu einem exklusiven national-jüdischen Messianismus. Die andere Gruppe wird zuerst sichtbar in den vielen Zöllnern und Sündern, die mit Jesus zu Tische liegen (2,15). Für ihre Mitglieder ist es kennzeichnend, daß sie, auch wenn sie der Rasse nach Juden sein mögen, mit dem institutionellen Israel nichts zu tun haben. Unter verschiedenen Bezeichnungen (Menge, die um ihn, Kind, Kinder, Nachfolgende) wird die Präsenz dieser Gruppe bei Jesus festgestellt. Sie zeichnet sich dadurch aus, daß sie die Lehre Jesu vorurteilslos und verständig annimmt. Sie ist es auch, die die Mission übernimmt und die Botschaft Jesu zu den Völkern trägt. Die These unterscheidet klar zwischen den Guten und den Bösen. Die Bösen kommen aus dem institutionellen Israel, sind für Jesus unzugänglich und bleiben bei ihren nationalmessianischen Erwartungen. Die Guten haben nichts (mehr) mit dem institutionellen Israel zu tun und machen sich die Botschaft Jesu zu eigen. Die Mission geschieht in einer völligen (markionitischen?) Loslösung von Israel.

Es besteht kein Zweifel daran, daß bei Markus das Unverständnis und das Versagen der Jünger stark hervorgehoben werden. Auch ist der Schluß des uns vorliegenden Markusevangeliums mit Furcht, Flucht und Schweigen der Frauen (16,8) ein altes Problem der Exegese. Es besteht aber auch daran kein Zweifel, daß die Jünger und die Zwölf vom Anfang (1,16-20) bis zum Schluß (16,7) diejenigen sind, die sich ständig bei Jesus aufhalten und denen sich Jesus am meisten zuwendet. Das fundamentale Problem betrifft das Gesamtverständnis des Markusevangeliums: Ist es vor allem ein polemisches Werk, in dem diejenigen, die Jesus am nächsten sind, als die unverständigen Versager gebrandmarkt werden? Oder ist es ein Werk, dem aller Triumphalismus fremd ist, das gerade am Unverständnis und am Versagen der Jünger Jesu zeigt, wie groß das Geheimnis der Person Jesu ist, was es kostet, seinen Weg zu gehen, wie Jesus diesen Weg allein gegangen ist, wie der Auferstandene einen neuen Anfang schenkt? Ist es ein Werk, das vor aller Selbstsicherheit warnt und jedem, der versagt, Mut macht? Oder ist es ein Werk, das diejenigen, die aus Israel kommen, selbstsicher verurteilt? M. vermutet als

historischen Hintergrund für die Polemik des Markus die Auseinandersetzung zwischen judaistischen und heidenchristlichen Gruppen in der Urkirche (702-706). Indem Markus ein polemischer Grundcharakter zugewiesen wird und die Zwölf als Hauptziel der Polemik verstanden werden, wird diese Schrift zu einem Sonderfall im NT gemacht. Auch in anderen Schriften des NT gibt es viel Polemik (cf. Joh; Paulus), aber nirgends sind die Zwölf das Hauptziel der Polemik. Es wird auch nicht recht verständlich, wie Markus den Petrus und die Jünger als diejenigen darstellen soll, die sich dem Ruf des Auferstandenen verweigert haben; nach dem einhelligen Zeugnis der anderen Traditionen des NT ist der Auferstandene ihnen zuerst begegnet (cf. nur Lk 24,34; 1 Kor 15,5). Auf die breite Diskussion um den Sinn von Mk 16,1-8 und besonders 16,8 geht M. kaum ein (502-513).

Ein Hauptanliegen von M. ist es, bei Markus eine positive Gruppe von ständigen Nachfolgern Jesu aufzuweisen. Da für sie eine einheitliche Terminologie fehlt, kann sie nur unter verschiedenen Bezeichnungen aufgedeckt werden. Sie ist präsent in den Zöllnern und Sündern (2,15), in der Menge, die Jesus als seine Familie bezeichnet (3,31-35), die Jesus dicht umgibt (5,24-31) und die Jesus herbeiruft (7,14; 8,34), in denen um Jesus (4,10), in dem Kind (9,36) und den Kindern (10,13-16) und in den Nachfolgenden (10,32). Repräsentativ ist für sie der fremde Exorzist (9,38-40) und Simon von Cyrene (15,21). Es bedarf einiger exegetischer Mühe, hinter diesen etwas disparaten Größen eine feste Gruppe zu entdecken. Wir können nur auf einige dieser Textinterpretationen eingehen. Unter dem in 9,36 erwähnten *paidion* wird nicht so sehr ein kleines Kind, sondern ein kleiner Diener verstanden. Daraus, daß Jesus ihn nicht herbeiruft (in Gegensatz zu den Zwölf 9,35), sondern gleich umarmt, wird geschlossen, daß er sich immer schon bei Jesus befindet, zu seiner ständigen Begleitung gehört. Er wird dann verstanden als Repräsentant der Gruppe, die den Jüngern entgegengesetzt ist, die sich Jesu Lehre über das Dienen ganz zu eigen gemacht hat, die von Jesus den Zwölf als Vorbild hingestellt wird (402-409). M. arbeitet hier teilweise mit dem *argumentum e silentio* (nicht herbeigerufen = ständig gegenwärtig) und unterläßt es, den sonstigen Gebrauch von '*paidion*' bei Markus zu untersuchen (5,39-41; 7,28.30; 9,24), obwohl er sonst lange Wortuntersuchungen anstellt (cf. *oikos* und *oikia* 217-252; *kōmē* 283-294). Auch die *paidia* in 10,13-16 werden nicht als Kinder verstanden, sondern als neue Mitglieder der Gegengruppe, die Jesus zugeführt und von ihm gegen den Widerstand der Jünger liebevoll aufgenommen werden (442-452). Bei der Auslegung von 9,38-40 wird in Johannes der autoritäre Vertreter des Judentums gesehen, der alle anderen auf die eigene Linie zwingen will, und in dem Exorzisten der Vertreter der Gegengruppe, die von Jesus mit der gleichen Vollmacht ausgestattet wurde und diese erfolgreich einsetzt (410-429). Von anderen Schwierigkeiten abgesehen, ist dann nicht recht zu verstehen (und wird von M. auch nicht erwähnt), daß Jesus das 'Wir' des Johannes aufnimmt (9,38.40) und von der Gruppe, die ihm näher stehen soll als die Zwölf sagt: "Wer nicht gegen uns ist, der ist für uns". Der positive Charakter dieser Gruppe, daß sie die Unterweisung Jesu versteht und sich dieselbe zu eigen macht, scheint über ein *argumentum e silentio* gewonnen zu werden. Nur die Jünger erbitten und erhalten besondere Belehrungen durch Jesus (4,34; 7,17; 9,2-13.28). Daraus wird geschlossen, daß die Gegengruppe

einer solchen Belehrung gar nicht bedarf, sondern alles verstanden und angenommen hat (320, 385-393, 490, 686). Schwierigkeiten macht es auch, daß diese Gruppe in 11,1-16,8 nicht mehr identifiziert werden kann. Ihre Abwesenheit beim Letzten Mahl wird damit erklärt, daß das Letzte Mahl Elemente enthält, die nur für diejenigen bedeutsam sind, die aus Israel kommen, und daß ihre Teilnahme an diesem Mahl im Mahl mit den Zöllnern und Sündern (2,15) schon vorweggenommen wurde (533-552). Außerdem sollen die Teilnehmer des Mahles, insofern sie 'Jünger' genannt werden, die Nachfolge Jesu auf der persönlichen Ebene repräsentieren und die Bestimmung dieses Mahles für alle Nachfolger Jesu anzeigen (479, 536). Etwas verwundert stellt man fest, daß sich hier eine Brücke zwischen den beiden Gruppen zeigt, die sonst durch einen tiefen Graben voneinander getrennt sind. Die letzte positive Größe ist Simon von Cyrene (15,21), das totale Gegenbild zu Simon Petrus. Er ist nicht nur der Repräsentant der positiven Gruppe, die Jesu Belehrung über das Kreuztragen angenommen hat (8,34-9,1). An ihm soll auch deutlich werden, daß diese Gruppe den missionarischen Auftrag Jesu übernommen und seine Botschaft an die Nicht-Israeliten weitergegeben hat. Daß er als Vater von Alexander (griechischer Name) und Rufus (lateinischer Name) bezeichnet wird, soll bedeuten, daß von dieser Gruppe her die heidenchristlichen Gemeinden im griechischen und lateinischen Kulturraum ihren Ausgang genommen haben (500, 701). Es fällt schwer, eine Begründung für diese allegorische Auslegung der Stelle zu erkennen. Der Versuch, eine Gegengruppe zu identifizieren, der alle positiven Eigenschaften und Aufgaben zukommen, die sonst die Jünger haben, scheint insgesamt wenig geglückt zu sein.

Auf ein die ganze Arbeit durchziehendes methodisches Problem soll noch hingewiesen werden. Immer wieder trifft man auf die Bemerkung 'das heißt, das meint', und es folgt dann eine Interpretation, die man kaum anders als allegorisch bezeichnen kann. Es sollen nur einige Beispiele angeführt werden. Der 'unreine Geist' (1,23-28) bedeutet die Lehre der Schriftgelehrten, die eine dem Plan Gottes diametral entgegengesetzte Ideologie darstellt. Besessen ist derjenige, der dieser Lehre bedingungslos anhängt. 'Dämonen austreiben' heißt einen Menschen von dieser Lehre befreien und für die Annahme der Botschaft Jesu öffnen. Die Jünger sind dazu unfähig (9,28), weil sie selber an der Messiaserwartung der Schriftgelehrten festhalten (163-167, 197, 699). Von der gezwungenen Auslegung von 1,24 (163) abgesehen, fragt man sich, wie diese Interpretation auf die besessenen Kinder von 7,24-30; 9,14-27 angewendet werden soll und wie Markus von den Zwölf sagen kann, daß sie viele Dämonen austrieben (6,13). Im Fieber (*pyretos*) der Schwiegermutter des Petrus (1,29-31) drückt sich die Situation des Petrus aus. Er gehört zu Kreisen, die gegen die Korruption der Institutionen auftreten und von einem gewaltsamen Reformeifer wie der Prophet Elias erfüllt sind. Diese Auslegung wird damit begründet, daß in Sir 48,1-9 das Feuer (*pyr*) Symbol für den Eifer des Elias ist (576-578). Sie scheint in einer unkontrollierbaren und willkürlich Wörter kombinierenden Weise weit über die Textaussage hinauszuführen. Der Gelähmte, der zu Jesus gebracht wird (2,1-12), repräsentiert die ganze nicht-israelitische Menschheit und ihren desolaten Zustand. Dies soll daraus hervorgehen, daß ausdrücklich und erzählerisch überflüssig gesagt wird, wie er von vier getragen wurde. Die Zahl 'vier' aber ist Symbol für die Welt und

die Menschheit (267-270; 720-736). 'Erzählerisch überflüssig' (720) dürfte ein subjektiver Maßstab sein, der auch bei literar- und redaktionskritischen Operationen in oft wenig überzeugender Weise verwendet wird. Der Übergang von den vier Männern zu dem Gelähmten als Repräsentanten der ganzen Menschheit erscheint als wenig sicher. Es besteht kein Zweifel daran, daß dem Vorgang in 2,1-12 eine alle Menschen betreffende Bedeutung zukommt. Das geht aber nicht aus einzelnen allegorischen Verweisen hervor, sondern aus dem Wort Jesu (2,10) und aus der Einordnung dieses Vorgangs in die programmatische Beschreibung des Heilandswirkens Jesu (cf. W. Thissen, *Erzählung der Befreiung* [Würzburg 1976]). Überall stellt sich das Problem eines geregelten und kontrollierbaren Übergangs von der Erzählebene auf die allegorische Ebene. Es dürfte fruchtbarer und textgemäßer sein, in den Perikopen des Markus nicht Allegorien zu sehen, auch nicht Erzählungen, die mit allegorischen Einzelementen durchsetzt sind, sondern Erzählungen, die in sich kohärent sind und als ganze und von ihrem ganzen Kontext her ihre Botschaft mitteilen wollen.

Die Probleme der Markauslegung sind Legion. Mit ihren vielen genauen Beobachtungen zum Text und mit ihren Interpretationen kann die Arbeit manche Anregung geben.

Tschurtschenthalerstrasse 7
A-6020 Innsbruck

Klemens STOCK

J. ROLOFF, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (Das Neue Testament Deutsch 5)
385 p. Göttingen 1981. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

J. Roloff opens his commentary on the Acts of the Apostles with a quite brief (16 pages) introduction. First, he considers the title, author, and place of origin of the book. He next turns to its literary character, historical reliability, and Luke's style and literary technique. A proposed structure of Acts, some observations about the text, and a short bibliography close the introduction. Most of the bibliography consists of German titles.

Roloff provides then a general analysis of each pericope and a verse-by-verse explanation. He furthermore provides brief indices of names and topics, of abbreviations, and a map of the East Mediterranean in the New Testament times.

In order to put what additional comments or observations that will be made into proper perspective, it must be said that overall Roloff has produced a creditable and worthwhile commentary. True Roloff has read a great deal on Acts and has gathered and weighed a mass of material. He has much to say on Acts that justifies a student's devoting his energy to the reading of the commentary and to reflecting on Roloff's opinions. However, there are some real difficulties.

Perhaps some of the limitations of Roloff's commentary are imposed on him by the editors of the series. The elimination of footnotes as an editorial policy 'for instance' does not encourage a scholar to reach beyond his own language area, for the sake of coming to a balanced and informed conclusion about the correct understanding of a given pericope. The requirement of footnotes would have helped Roloff make a much greater contribution to the overall knowledge of Acts. At times, indeed, Roloff does not pay sufficient attention even to his own fellow German scholars.

However, the blame to be placed on the editors of *Das Neue Testament Deutsch* should not be exaggerated. A short summary of Luke's theology or of Luke's main themes and concerns in Roloff's introduction would have allowed the reader better to follow his whole exposition of Acts. For instance, Roloff is well aware that Luke believes that Christians are the true Israel and that the salvific activity of God in the Old Testament continues in Jesus and his followers, that this constitutes Luke's main theological concern. But Roloff's reader gets little direction in determining this.

Moreover, Roloff has misrepresented Luke's thought on a number of his major concerns. Although he frequently points to activities of the risen Christ, Roloff appears to be under the impression that the risen Christ resides at the Father's right hand. To an extent, this is perfectly true. But if the risen Christ continues to be active among the Christians, an exegete has to nuance the way in which he speaks of Jesus "being at the right hand of the Father", and Luke certainly believes that the risen Christ *is* active among the Christians. In both Luke and Acts, Luke predicts repeated activity of the risen Jesus in a number of areas: the Eucharist (Luke 24,31,35), the Holy Spirit (Luke 24,49; Acts 1,2,8; 2,33,38-39; 16,6-7), in the preaching of his witnesses (Acts 3,22-23; 18,5-11; 26,23), in his name (Acts 2,21,38; 3,6,16; 4,12; 10,43; 16,18), in finding salvation in the present (Acts 4,12) which embraces repentance, forgiveness of sins, grace, and resurrection, in visions (Acts 7,55-56; 9 par.; 22,17-21), and, finally in signs and wonders (Acts 4,29-30). The best understanding of phrases like "being added to the Lord" (Acts 5,14; 11,24) and "to speak in the name" (Acts 4,17-18; 5,40,42; 8,12; 9,27-28) is in the context of the presence of the risen Lord in the proclaimed word, and in interaction between him and the Christians. From this it follows that the Holy Spirit in Luke is only one of the ways in which the risen Jesus is present. For a thorough discussion of this topic see my "Activity of the Risen Christ in Luke-Acts", *Bib* 62 (1981) 471-498. Roloff on this point does indicate that Paul is only the instrument of the risen Jesus who himself preaches light to people and to the Gentiles (pp. 354-355), but he does not realize that logically Peter must also be speaking in Jesus's name in Acts 3,22-23. Nor, other than in his commentary on Acts 26,23, has Roloff asked whether Luke maintained that the risen Christ was active in his disciples. They carry on his work, or, perhaps better, the risen Christ through them carries on his work.

Roloff has not perceived the importance of the Lucan parallels between Jesus and his disciples. True, some authors have exaggerated the claims for parallels and, hence, have rendered any assertion of parallels in Luke-Acts suspect. But Roloff has not paid sufficient attention to such scholars as

W. Radl (*Paulus und Jesus im lukanischen Doppelwerk: Untersuchungen zu Parallelmotiven in Lukasevangelium und in der Apostelgeschichte* [Frankfurt 1975]) whom he mentions in his bibliography. The parallels between Jesus and all of his disciples but especially those between Jesus and Stephen, and then Paul, cannot be dismissed in the cavalier manner Roloff uses on pp. 113, 128, 349. Probably, Luke's main aim in these parallels was to establish the continuity between his Gospel and the Acts of the Apostles. But secondary Lucan concerns for the presence of the risen Christ in his disciples, for a defense for Stephen and Paul and the disciples' imitation of Jesus should not be disregarded.

The Lucan theme of Christ as the Savior of the Disadvantaged is given almost no consideration whatever in Roloff's commentary. Yet this theme does not cease with the end of Luke's Gospel. Jesus continues to be the savior of sinners, women, the sick, the poor, the persecuted and other disadvantaged people, though now he acts through his disciples.

Let us consider Jesus as the savior of women. Luke is fond of parallels in which first a man plays a role then a woman. Both men and women in Samaria believe the good news and are baptized (Acts 8,12). Peter at Lydda heals the paralytic Aeneas (Acts 9,32-35). Luke then narrates Peter's raising Tabitha from the dead (Acts 9,36-43). Dionysius the Areopagite and a woman named Damaris join Paul and believe what he proclaimed at Athens (Acts 17,34). Couples also appear in Acts. Aquila and Priscilla are the ideal missionary couple. Her name is given before his more often than not (Acts 18,2,18,26). Unfortunately, Ananias and Sapphira demonstrate the dishonest use of money in the community. Needless to say, the story about Sapphira (Acts 5,7-11) parallels that of Ananias (Acts 5,2-6) in detail.

Sometimes, Luke refers first to the woman and then to the man. Paul accepts the hospitality of Lydia in Philippi (Acts 16,14-15). When he is in Thessalonica, still located in Macedonia, Jason is his host (Acts 17,5-9). Perhaps, it would be more correct to note that Paul first converts Lydia, then, the jailor in Philippi.

Luke shows a concern for widows: he gives notice of the neglect of Greek-speaking widows in Acts 6,1, and steps are taken to correct the injustices. Dorcas cared for needy widows (Acts 9,36-42). As Jesus raised the daughter of Jairus (Luke 8,54), so Peter raises Dorcas from the dead and calling together the saints and widows he presents her alive.

Women play a role in the early church. Mary, Jesus' mother, and other women, join the apostles and Jesus' relatives in prayer. These verses do not depict a passing event, for the Greek imperfects imply that their ordinary activity is being described. The quote from Joel 3,1-5 (cf. Acts 2,17-21) includes "your daughters... my maidservants". Finally, the owners of the slave girl (Acts 16,16-19) who had a spirit of divination use her only for profit. After she has annoyed Paul for many days, Paul says, not to the slave girl, but to the demon, "I charge you in the name of Jesus Christ to come out of her" (Acts 16,18). The risen Christ, then, continues to be the savior of disadvantaged women through his disciples.

Luke has an extensive pattern of expressions like "joy", "wonder", "blessing", and "praise" as reactions which he feels are appropriate to the

experience of God's salvific will. Roloff at times notes these expressions, but does not seem to regard them as a Lucan concern. For example, Acts 3,1-4,31 should be considered as a unit because the cure of the cripple at the Beautiful Gate or references to this cure occur and form part of the subject matter of every pericope in this unit. Roloff (pp. 68-70) regards Acts 3,1-10 as a very schematic and conventional miracle story, an assertion which doubtless is partly true. But he has not appreciated that in the six verses (Acts 3,8-13) which immediately follow the cure Luke has concentrated a demonstration of the kind of reception Christ's bringing of the Father's salvation should have. In six verses, Luke speaks of "leaping", "leaping up", "praise", "wonder", "amazement", and "being astounded". The only other Lucan passage which surpasses this one for the appropriate reactions to the experience of God's salvific will is Luke 15.

Some further observations should be made about Roloff's exposition. He has tremendous confidence in his ability to unveil Luke's sources. Roloff has demonstrated remarkable ingenuity and attention to the text in his efforts to detect these sources. Nonetheless, his results are questionable and still generally vague. They do not permit us to discover exactly how Luke used his sources. At times, Roloff so dedicates himself to the historical question that his reader loses sight of what Luke's meaning in a given pericope is.

In his discussion as to why Christians are baptized at all (pp. 61-63), Roloff grants little significance to the fact that Jesus himself was baptized. Yet Luke's scene of Jesus' baptism has aspects (e.g. the heavenly origin and the Holy Spirit) which appear at Pentecost, too. Moreover, Luke calls Pentecost a baptism (cf. Acts 1,5).

There are a number of Roloff's interpretations which could have been nuanced or changed if he had paid more attention to secondary literature. For instance, Roloff does not cite in his bibliography G. Lohfink's *Paulus vor Damaskus* (Stuttgart 1965). Lohfink on the basis of Old Testament passages (Gen 31,11-13; 46,2-3; Exod 3,2-10; cf. Gen 22,1-2.11-12; 1 Sam 3,4-14) concludes to a literary form which he designates *Erscheinungsgespräche*. This literary form in its fuller expression consists of a double vocative, the question of the man, the self-presentation of the one appearing, and a mission. Although Roloff (pp. 168-169) recognizes a similar genre for Acts 10,3-6, he has not applied this knowledge to Acts 9,4-6; 22,7-10; 26,14-16. Thus he does not use the best argument for the fact that Luke knew Paul had a vision but, having no further data, he expressed Paul's experience with this genre.

Yet, all things considered, Roloff's commentary still merits serious attention.

St. Louis University
3634 Lindel Boulevard
St. Louis, MO 63108

Robert F. O'TOOLE, S. J.

NUNTII PERSONARUM ET RERUM

Pontificium Institutum Biblicum Annus academicus 1983-1984. I semestre

Auditores inscripti erant 289, qui in diversas categorias sic distribuebantur:

	Ad Doctoratum	Ad Licentiam	Hospites	Universi
Fac. Biblica	17	246	22	285
Fac. Orientalistica	–	1	3	4
Universi	17	247	25	289
Nationes	50	Alumni		289
Dioceses	143	Alumni		145
Inst. Religiosorum	47	Alumni		116
Inst. Religiosarum	7	Alumnae		8
Ex statu laicali	20	Alumnae		12
		Alumni		8

Laureae

Laurea in Re Biblica digni declarati sunt:

FITZGERALD, Aloysius, F.S.C. (27.V.83). *The Lord of the East Wind* (Cum laude). Moderator: D. MCCARTHY.

HERMAN, Zvonimir, O.F.M. (1.VI.83). *Il presente salvifico* (Cum laude). Moderator: A. VANHOYE.

TOSCO, Lorenzo, C.S.J. (10.VI.83). *Pietro e Paolo ministri del giudizio di Dio* (Magna cum laude). Moderator: F. LENTZEN-DEIS.

BUETUBELA, Balembo (13.VI.83). *Jean-Baptiste dans l'évangile de Marc* (Cum laude). Moderator: I. DE LA POTTERIE.

Doctor in Re Biblica renuntiatus est, typis edita thesi:

KALLUVEETIL, Paul, *Declaration and Covenant. A Comprehensive Review of Covenant Formulae from the Old Testament and the Ancient Near East* (Analecta Biblica 88). xi-284 p. Roma 1982. Biblical Institute Press.

An International Congress on Biblical Archaeology

On April 1-10, 1984, an International Congress on Biblical Archaeology will take place in Jerusalem to mark the 70th anniversary of the Israel Exploration Society. The Congress is being organized by the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities and the Israel Exploration Society.

The major objective of the Congress is to examine and present an up-to-date review of the progress of archaeological research related to the Bible and Bible lands from the Canaanite to Herodian periods.

For further information write to:

Secretariat

International Congress on Biblical Archaeology

P.O.B. 500

91004 Jerusalem

Israel

LIBRI AD DIRECTIONEM MISSI

La liste ci-dessous comprend tous les livres adressés à *Biblica* qui sont en rapport avec les études bibliques, y compris ceux qui ne pourront faire l'objet d'un compte rendu. En signalant un ouvrage, la Revue ne se prononce pas à son sujet.

Les livres envoyés à la Revue ne seront pas retournés à l'expéditeur, même si aucun compte rendu n'en est publié (à moins qu'ils n'aient été envoyés sur demande de la Direction).

Les livres et les articles ou extraits de revues qui nous sont adressés seront communiqués au directeur de l'*Elenchus bibliographicus biblicus*.

Prière d'adresser les envois à la «Direction de *Biblica*, Pontificio Istituto Biblico, Via della Pilotta 25, 00187 Rome, Italie».

Vetus Testamentum

Abrego, José María, *Jeremías y el Final del Reino*. Lectura sincrónica de Jer 36-45 (Institución San Jerónimo para la Investigación Bíblica Estudios del Antiguo Testamento 3). 220 p. 24,1 × 15,2. Valencia 1983. Institución San Jerónimo.

Aletti, J. N., – **Trublet, J.**, *Approche poétique et théologique des Psaumes*. Analyses et Méthodes («Initiations»). 272 p. 21,5 × 13,5. Paris 1983. Le Cerf. FF 145.

Alonso Schökel, L. – **Sicre Diaz, J. L.**, *Job. Comentario teológico y literario* (Nueva Biblia Española). 634 p. 24 × 15,5. Madrid 1983. Ediciones Cristiandad.

Brésard, Luc, *Bernard et Origène commentent le Cantique*. 73 p. 15,5 × 23,2. Forges 1983. Cisterciensia.

Carmichael, Calum, *The Ten Commandments*. The Ninth Sacks Lecture delivered on 25th May 1982. 27 p. 20,9 × 15. Oxford 1983. Oxford Centre for Postgraduate Hebrew Studies.

Craven, Toni, *Artistry and Faith in the Book of Judith* (SBL Dissertation Series 70). 139 p. 21,5 × 13,5. Chico CA. 1983. Scholars Press. US \$11.25.

Díez Macho, A., *Apócrifos del Antiguo Testamento*, Tomo II, 525 p. Tomo III, 398 p. 15,5 × 24. Madrid, 1983. Ediciones Cristiandad.

Kenik, Helen A., *Design for Kingship, The Deuteronomistic Narrative Technique in 1 Kings 3:4-15* (SBL Dissertation Series 69). vii-249 p. 13,6 × 21,4. Chico, CA 1983. Scholars Press. US \$13.50.

Landy, Francis, *Paradoxes of Paradise*. Identity and Difference in the Song of Songs (Bible and Literature Series 7). 410 p. 13,6 × 21,5. Sheffield – Winona Lake, Indiana 1983. The Almond Press – Eisenbrauns. US \$16.95.

Lindström, Fredrik, *God and the Origin of Evil*. A Contextual Analysis of Alleged Monistic Evidence in the Old Testament. 272 p. 15,5 × 22,3. Lund 1983. CWK Gleerup.

McCurley, Foster R., *Ancient Myths and Biblical Faith*. Scriptural Transformation. x-192 p. 13,9 × 21,5. Philadelphia 1983. Fortress Press.

Padri della Chiesa, I Padri commentano il Salterio della Tradizione, a cura di Dom Jean-Claude Nesmy. Edizione italiana, riveduta sugli originali, di Paolo Pinelli e Luisa Volpi. 797 p. 21 × 14,5. Torino 1983. Gribaudi.

Pesce, Mauro (Ed.), *Isaia, il diletto e la Chiesa*. Visione ed esegesi profetica cristiano-primitiva nell'Ascensione di Isaia. Atti del Convegno di Roma, 9-10 aprile 1981, editi a cura di Mauro Pesce (Testi e ricerche di Scienze religiose 20). 320 p. 22,1 × 15. Brescia 1983. Lit. 20.000.

Richter, Wolfgang, *Transliteration und Transkription*. Objekt- und metasprachliche Metazeichensysteme zur Wiedergabe hebräischer Texte (Arbeiten zu Text und Sprache im Alten Testament 19). xi-155 p. 21 × 14,5. St. Ottilien 1983. EOS Verlag. DM 30,00.

LXX. Il Salterio della Tradizione. Versione del Salterio greco dei LXX a cura di Luciana Mortari. 333 p. 21 × 14,5. Torino 1983. Gribaudi. Lit. 25.000.

Tal, Abraham, *The Samaritan Targum of the Pentateuch*. A Critical Edition. Part III: Introduction (Texts and Studies in the Hebrew Language and Related Subjects VI). 343 p. 24,3 × 17,4. Tel-Aviv 1983. Tel-Aviv University.

Vawter, Bruce, *Job & Jonah*. Questioning the Hidden God. v-128 p. 13,6 × 20,2. New York – Ramsey 1983. Paulist Press. \$4.95.

Westermann, Claus, *Teologia dell'Antico Testamento* (Antico Testamento Supplementi 6). 337 p. 21 × 15. Brescia 1983. Paideia Editrice. Lit. 20.000.

Novum Testamentum

Brown, Raymond E., *La communauté du disciple bien-aimé*. Traduit de l'anglais par F. M. Godefroid (Lectio Divina 115). 232 p. 21,5 × 13,5. Paris 1983. Le Cerf. FF 128.

Busemann, Rolf, *Die Jünergemeinde nach Markus 10*. Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung des 10. Kapitels im Markusevangelium (Bonner Biblische Beiträge 57. Herausgegeben von Frank Lothar Hossfeld und Helmut

Merklein). 278 p. 24,5 × 16,5. Königstein/Ts - Bonn 1983. Peter Hanstein Verlag.

Cassidy, R. J. - Scharper, P. J. (Editors), *Political Issues in Luke-Acts*. ix-180 p. 23,5 × 14,9. New York 1983. Orbis Books.

Culpepper, R. Alan, *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel. A Study in Literary Design* (New Testament Foundations and Facets). xii-266 p. 24,2 × 16. Philadelphia, PA 1983. Fortress Press.

Dimino, Ignazio, *Maria Maddalena nei vangeli*. Storia di una Leggenda. 84 p. 15,5 × 22. Scaicca 1983. Edizioni «Domus Mea».

Dodd, Charles Harold, *La tradizione storica nel quarto vangelo* (Biblioteca Teologica 20). 528 p. 22,7 × 15,6. Brescia 1983. Paideia Editrice. Lit. 40.000.

Gnilka, Joachim, *Johannesevangelium* (Die neue Echter-Bibel: Kommentar zum Neuen Testament mit d. Einheitsübers., Lfg. 1). 164 p. 23,5 × 15,5. Würzburg 1983. Echter Verlag. DM 34,—.

Hahn, Ferdinand, *Historical Investigation and New Testament Faith*. Two Essays. Translated by Robert Maddox. 112 p. 21,5 × 14. Philadelphia, PA. 1983. Fortress Press. US \$6.95.

Hawthorne, Gerald F., *Philippians* (World Biblical Commentary 43). lii-232 p. 15,8 × 23,5. Waco, Texas 1983. Word Books.

Hays, Richard B., *The Faith of Jesus Christ*. An Investigation of the Narrative Substructure of Galatians 3:1-4:11 (SBL Dissertation Series 56) x-305 p. 13,5 × 21,5. Chico, CA 1983. Scholars Press. US \$15.00.

Koester, Helmut, *History, Culture, and Religion of the Hellenistic Age* (Introduction to the New Testament I). 428 p. *History and Literature of Early Christianity* (Vol. II). 364 p. 24 × 15,6. Philadelphia 1983. Fortress Press. Berlin - New York 1983. Walter de Gruyter.

Moo, Douglas J., *The Old Testament in the Gospel Passion Narratives*. xi-468 p. 15,2 × 23,2. Sheffield - Winona Lake, Indiana 1983. The Almond Press - Eisenbrauns. US \$17.95.

Moriconi, Bruno, *Lo Spirito et le Chiese*. Saggio sul termine «πνεῦμα» nel libro dell'Apocalisse (Studia Theologica Teresianum 3). 227 p. 21,5 × 15,5. Roma 1983. Edizioni del Teresianum.

Muñoz Iglesias, Salvador, *Los Canticos del Evangelio de la Infancia segun San Lucas* (Puer Natus, Estudios en torno a los Evangelios de la Infancia 1). x-373 p. 14 × 23. Madrid 1983. Instituto Francisco Suarez, del C.S.I.C. US \$20.00.

Murphy-O'Connor, Jerome, *St. Paul's Corinth*. Texts and Archaeology (Good News Studies 6). xxi-192 p. 21 × 13,4. Wilmington DL. 1983. Michael Glazier, Inc. US \$7.95.

Orchard, John Bernard, *A Synopsis of the Four Gospels*. In Greek Arranged According to the Two-Gospel Hypothesis. xxxiv-342 p. 23,5 × 26. Göttingen 1983. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Pazzini, Domenico, *In principio era il Logos*. Origene e il prologo del Vangelo di Giovanni (Studi Biblici 64). 130 p. 20,8 × 13,5. Brescia 1983. Paideia Editrice. Lit. 8.000.

Pesch, Rudolf, *Römerbrief* (Die Neue Echter Bibel, Kommentar zum Neuen Testament mit der Einheitsübersetzung/ hrsg. von Joachim **Gnilka** u. Rudolf **Schnackenburg**. Bd. 6). 112 p. 15,5 × 23,5. Würzburg 1983. Echter Verlag. DM 28,—.

Poppi, Angelico, *Sinossi dei quattro Vangeli*. Volume I – Testo. 323 p. 16,5 × 24. Padova 1983. Edizioni Messaggero Padova. Lit. 14.000.

Sanders, E. P., *Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People*. 240 p. 23,5 × 16. Philadelphia, PA 1983. Fortress Press. US \$19.95.

Schürmann Heinz, *Gottes Reich – Jesu Geschick*. Jesu ureigener Tod im Licht seiner Basilea-Verkündigung. 269 p. 21,4 × 13,3. Freiburg – Basel – Wien 1983. Herder.

Scroggs, Robin, *The New Testament and Homosexuality*. Contextual Background for Contemporary Debate. viii-158 p. 14,2 × 22,2. Philadelphia, PA. 1983. Fortress Press.

Serra, Aristide M., *Marie à Cana. Marie près de la Croix* (Jean 2,1-12 et 19,25-27). Traduit de l'italien par Dominique Jahan (Lire la Bible 64). 157 p. 18 × 11,5. Paris 1983. Le Cerf. FF. 50.

Senior, Donald, *What Are they Saying about Matthew?* 96 p. 13,5 × 20,4. New York – Ramsey 1983. Paulist Press. US \$3.95.

Sloyan, Gerard S., *Jesus in Focus*. A Life in its Setting. 212 p. 14 × 21,6. Mystic, CT 1983. Twenty-Third Publications. US \$7.95.

Supplément au Dictionnaire de la Bible, sous la direction de Henri **Cazelles** et André **Feuillet**. Fasc. 56: Résurrection de Jésus – Romains (Épître). Col. 509-764. 19,9 × 28,1. Paris 1982. FF 228.

Supplément au Dictionnaire de la Bible, sous la direction de Henri **Cazelles** et André **Feuillet**. Fasc. 57: Romains (Épître) – Routes. Col. 765-1080. 19,9 × 28,1. Paris 1982. FF 240.

Verner, David C., *The Household of God*. The Social World of the Pastoral Epistles (SBL Dissertation Series 71). ix-207 p. 21,5 × 13,5. Chico, CA. 1983. Scholars Press. US \$13.50.

ISSN 0006-0887

PIETRO BOCCACCIO, Direttore Responsabile

Autorizz. Tribunale di Roma n. 6229 del 24-3-1958 del Reg. della Stampa

SCUOLA TIPOGRAFICA S. PIO X – VIA DEGLI ETRUSCHI, 7-9 ROMA – Gennaio 1984